

THE INDIA CHARTER

BEING A DESCRIPTION OF THE
VICIOUS CIRCLES — SMALL AND GREAT
CONSTITUTING

THE INDIAN POLITICAL DEADLOCK :
INCLUDING AN EXPOSITION OF THE
HINDU-MUSLIM COMMUNAL PROBLEM

AND ITS COROLLARY — PAKISTAN :

WITH SUGGESTIONS AS TO HOW
PLATFORMS OF COMMUNAL UNITY CAN BE EVOLVED—
THE CIRCLES SNAPPED—
THE PROBLEM AND THE DEADLOCK SOLVED AND DISSOLVED.
SUGGESTING FURTHER

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE FREE UNITED INDIA OF TOMORROW.

By

JEHANGIR FRAMJEE KOTEWAL

KARACHI - 1944

(ALL RIGHTS RESERVED)

Price Rs. 10/8 nett.

Printed by Faredun R. Mehta at the Sanj Vartaman Press, Apollo St., Fort, Bombay.
Published by Jehangir Framjee Kotewal, 73, Garden Road, Saddar, Karachi.

To
THE QUEEN OF MY HEART.
the noblest of her noble sex,
my life and my soul,
my ALOO
who
up life's arduous path,
in joy and in sorrow, hope and despair,
has been to me
ever my guiding star-
sustaining, up-lifting,
ever an inspiration to me:
in whom I could forget-to me the unforgettable-
my Mother.

“ Anything that a thoughtful and serious man can do, whatever his profession or vocation, to create a feeling of oneness in the Country, is probably the most worthwhile thing that he can be doing.”

Sir Mitza M. Smuil,
2nd December 1942.

FOREWORD

A number of books have recently been written about the Indian problem, especially with reference to the communal question. Mr. Jehangir Framjee Kotewal's book is one of the most constructive and helpful of these books. It has the distinctive merit of being both full of valuable information and inspired by sincerity of purpose. The author presents the case of each of the various parties involved in the problem as far as possible in the words of their authoritative spokesmen. The plan of the book is simple and it is best described in the author's own language: "It presents the principal political parties in the country and their creeds: it presents the British Government with their promise of Dominion Status: it presents the Political Problem as it stands to-day; it presents the Communal Problem as it stands to-day in relation to the Political Problem; it enumerates in detail the various communal differences and traces their growth to their present dimensions when *Separation* has come to be advanced as the only possible solution: it presents the views on Pakistan both of the Muslims and the Hindus: it accepts the principle of Pakistan but accepts it as the solution "in the last resort": it discusses whether the causes responsible for the desire for separation can be removed or neutralised: it suggests a Formula seeking to reach Communal Unity as a solution of the Communal Problem: it suggests a Formula for National Unity as based on the Communal Formula leading to a solution of the Political Problem of India".

The main features of the solution of the Indian problem offered in the book are the acceptance of Pakistan in principle, namely, the grant of freedom to Muslim majority provinces to remain in or keep out of the Federation of United India, the concession of the same freedom of choice to Indian States and equal representation of Hindus and Muslims on all legislative and public bodies and in the public services. If Muslim majority provinces and States do not join the Federation of United India, their relations with it will be governed by treaties. The intercommunal relations between Hindus and Muslims will be governed by a treaty of perpetual peace and concord between them, the provisions of which will relate to such subjects as cow sacrifice, music before mosque.

self-denying ordinance is intended to enable Hindus and Muslims to decide all questions of policy and administration on a footing of equality. As regards the Punjab, should it choose to join the Federation, the representation of Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs on such bodies will be in the proportions of 48, 24 and 24 per cent respectively, the remaining 4 per cent being the representation of other communities. Recruitment to public services in the provinces for Muslims, Hindus and other communities will be in the proportions of 40, 40 and 20 respectively. In the Punjab and in the Federal Services, the proportions for Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs and other communities will be 44, 22, 22 and 12 respectively. Communal electorates and reservation of seats in the ministries, legislatures, other public bodies and the public services will be subject to renewal or revision at the end of twenty years. As regards the Indian States, the rulers shall agree to place their administration in line with that in the provinces.

Mr. Kotewal's solution of the Indian problem does not lack courage. It is prompted by a desire to remove Muslims' dread of the prospect of remaining a perpetual minority under a constitution based on the parliamentary system. It is the result of conviction, born of a careful and exhaustive study of the present situation in the country, that the main problem before the Indian people is to remove this fear. The feature which distinguishes Mr. Kotewal's scheme from others of more or less similar nature is its insistence that a solution of this problem can only be attained through a great act of sacrifice, on the part not only of Hindus but also of minorities other than the Muslims. That such a solution has been offered by a member of one of these minorities is a measure of the earnestness of the author's desire to find a way of resolving the present deadlock. Opinions may differ on whether the way he has found is the right one. There is no doubt, however, that the book, especially with its appeal and challenge to the youth of the country, is very stimulating and thought-provoking.

Bombay, 5th April, 1944.

S. A. BRELVI.

INTRODUCTION

As the title of this little work indicates, it deals with what is commonly described as THE PROBLEM OF INDIA, a loose term which is generally understood to include the question of this Country's political status and goal, the factors which help or retard their realisation, and the ways and means calculated to assist in their achievement.

The most talked of, or read about, terms in the Country today, terms from which it seems one can expect no escape in his day to day life these days, are "THE COMMUNAL PROBLEM," "THE HINDU MUSLIM QUESTION," and "PAKISTAN." One has a vague idea that these are believed to be responsible for the non-materialisation of the "Swaraj" that one has been hearing of since the days of Dadabhoj Naoroji. One has also an impression that the British Government, as usual, somehow, have been having a hand in the game, and that most of the blame, if not all of it, must be placed at their door.

Torrents of oratory on the subject have flown and are flowing throughout the length and breadth of the Country which can stand comparison with the mightiest of our rivers, and a voluminous literature has sprung up both in English and in our various vernaculars, a veritable maze of arguments and counter arguments which have proved the despair of the Man in the Street. Everybody has been talking about the PROBLEM, many lightly, many gravely, many an earnest soul has sought to understand it, many have endeavoured to reach a solution calculated to evolve Communal Amity out of Communal Discord. Great minds and great organisations have applied their best efforts to the task, and many are the Schemes, Plans and Formulas that have been evolved, and are even now engaging the Country's attention. Many a learned work has scientifically traced the growth of the PROBLEM through the centuries. The Press of the Country has discussed the pros and cons threadbare. The Communal organisations have also produced considerable literature emphasising their own particular viewpoints.

To the Man in the Street,—and in this class would be comprised the average man and woman who are fully engrossed in the paramount task of earning his or her livelihood in these hard times, and who have little time to spare to go through all the extant literature on the subject, —to the Man in the Street whose number is Legion, the PROBLEM and the terms mentioned above convey little more than the vaguest suggestion that there is something wrong somewhere which keeps the Communities at loggerheads most of the time, and which sometimes flares up in disturbances and riots. He is also told that it is this phenomenon that has been and continues to be responsible for the denial of Freedom to this

Country at the hands of its Rulers. If he ever tries to get a clearer or fuller idea of the subject, he is handicapped by the fact that while there is a vast literature in existence dealing with the subject from various points of view, and these are not a few, there is hardly any compact work available giving the whole position in the briefest outline, setting forth the different points of view in juxtaposition, which could enable him to have, so to say, a bird's eye view of the situation, understand it for himself, form his own views, which would normally be sound commonsense views of things, and thus equip himself to make an intelligent contribution towards evolving a state of Concord out of the chaos of Discord that now prevails in the Country.

It is the aim of this little work to fill this void. It endeavours to present the various aspects of the Problem as various authorities have seen them, and to present them as far as possible in the words of those authorities. A considerable part of this work will thus be found to comprise extracts taken from various works, newspapers, speeches, etc., which are reproduced without change, leaving them to speak for themselves. In perusing these quotations and extracts, the reader will often observe some looseness in context and in phraseology, at times, even defective grammatical construction, at times also errors in spelling. This is due to the fact that I have reproduced these passages exactly as I have found them reported in the references quoted, without attempting to effect corrections. As this Volume holds the possibility of serving as a book of reference on the several matters included in it, I have deemed it advisable to reproduce the extracts, etc., exactly as they have been reported without any alteration or emendation on my part. This method must necessarily give the work a somewhat disjointed and slipshod appearance, but this will be found to be counter-balanced by the redeeming features that these extracts, etc., will be the fewest in number, the briefest, and wholly to the point or points they deal with.

The PLAN of this work is simple. It presents the principal Political parties in the Country, and their creeds: it presents the British Government, with their promise of Dominion Status: it presents the Political Problem as it stands today: it presents the Communal Problem as it stands today in relation to the Political Problem: it enumerates in detail the various communal differences and traces their growth to their present dimensions when *separation* has come to be advanced as the only possible solution: it presents the views on PAKISTAN both of the Muslims and the Hindus: it accepts the principle of PAKISTAN: but, accepts it as the solution "in the last resort": it discusses whether the causes re-ponsible for the desire for separation can be removed, or neutralised: it suggests a FORMULA seeking to reach COMMUNAL UNITY as a solution of the COMMUNAL PROBLEM: it suggests a

FORMULA for NATIONAL UNITY as based on the Communal Formula leading to the solution of the POLITICAL PROBLEM OF INDIA.

As an Indian thinker has observed, "the human mind is so constituted that it cannot rest content with negatives; it yearns for positive opinions and creates meaningful wholes. To deny knowledge and training to it is to leave it to the mercy of inherited dogmas, current prejudices and alluring catch-words, a prey to faction and demagoguery. The masses are heirs to a rich culture; they possess commonsense and integrity and appreciate the merits of mutual aid in common life. (a)" I believe that in spite of the existence of factors that have hitherto operated to induce clashes between the major communities, given certain altered conditions, an atmosphere of mutual goodwill, and a determination to "live and let live," it would not be impossible for these communities to live together in a Free India on terms of equality and amity, without the necessity of separation as is envisaged in Pakistan.

It is not my aim to produce a learned treatise on causes and effects which at the most can reach but a few even among the Country's intelligentsia. In a part of this work I have addressed our Elders and our Leaders, and through them the generation that has left its youth behind it, that finds itself burdened with the handicap of a narrow, circumscribed vision in matters communal, of fixed prejudices and dogmas, social barriers, a heritage of distrust amounting to a denial of the generous impulses of the human nature. They find themselves segregated into groups divided by unnatural barriers, encumbered with out of date customs, and observing rituals that have lost their original significance, and the continued observance of which has proved to be a perennial source of friction and antagonism between neighbours and between communities.

The effects of this unhappy legacy have been accentuated by an unfortunate combination of factors that threaten to develop into a serious setback to the peaceful progress of the Country in the social and political fields. Our Leaders—most of them—have developed obsessions: they have become incapable of taking long views of things: they have lost their sense of proportion, lost also the capacity correctly to appreciate values: their outlook on the larger problems of the Country is deplorably limited: they have shown themselves to be but small men pushed to the forefront by fortuitous circumstances: they have proved to be ill-equipped for, and unequal to, the task of leadership in great causes in times of great crises.

(a) "THE HINDU-MUSLIM QUESTIONS" by Prof. Beni Prasad, Allahabad University, page 35.

If, on the one hand, the Country is unfortunate in its Leaders, the Leaders, on the other hand, are equally unfortunate in their followings. We have ceased to think for ourselves : we are satisfied with leaving all judgment to our Leaders and accepting their lead without question. Leaders in Democracies look to their followings for guidance, and inspiration as also for assessment of their work : we in this Country, by our lack of interest, by our omission to think and judge for ourselves, have allowed our Leaders to cease to think and act in terms of responsibility: we have allowed them to develop into petty autocrats, Little Moghuls, whose littleness and pettiness cry out aloud in every statement they release to their folds and to the world. Differences over petty matters, which could and should have been settled with mutual goodwill and commonsense, have been allowed to assume country-wide proportions. Long catalogues of inter-communal grievances and counter-grievances have been drawn up with a zeal worthy of a better cause. Who will not hang down his head in shame and despair at the exhibition of pettiness and ill-humour, of narrow-minded bigotry, these catalogues make from end to end ? Alas, if this is what we are, if this is what our Leaders are, we offer but an ill-equipped, ill-fitted, unworthy home for Freedom to live in !

Cold analysis would reveal that our Differences in essence are not insurmountable and incapable of settlement. If they have helped our Rulers to retain their hold over us so far, such hold need not continue for ever : it need not continue at all : if we could but manage to take a detached view of the situation, the solutions would thrust themselves into our eyes, so obvious and patent they are. An attempt is made in this work to present the Differences stripped of the verbiage that surrounds them : an attempt is made to suggest what appear to be their obvious solutions : an attempt is also made to draw the attention of our Leaders and our Elders to the situation as now prevails in the Country, to the inevitable results of their present policies, to the harm they are doing to the cause of the Country advertently or inadvertently, to their obvious Duty, their obvious course of action today and tomorrow. The alternative is equally obvious. They must step aside and let other hands take charge of the steering wheel.

I have not made the above observations lightly : I have weighed every word : I am convinced that they correctly reflect the views of such of India's intelligentsia as can yet think and judge for themselves, and to whom India is, and will ever remain, FIRST. But while I have devoted space to the part of our Leaders and Elders in this Tragedy that is India today, my *Appeal* in compiling this work, principally, is to our *YOUTH*—our young men and women—God bless them—who have not yet advanced far from the threshold of Life, who are yet in their twenties and thirties, who are yet in their teens, approaching Life's threshold. It is an Appeal to these ardent souls now at Life's

threshold, full of energy, full of hope, full of patriotism, and, above all, full of the capacity to imbibe generous sentiments and cultivate the blessed spirit of Tolerance and Goodwill between man and man. It is an Appeal to these earnest souls who yearn to give expression to their nationalist instincts, their inborn pride in asserting themselves as INDIANS—not as mere Muslims, not as mere Hindus, but as Indians—INDIANS first, second and last—INDIANS always. These generous souls are not tied down hand and foot, as are the Elders, to meaningless dogmas, out of date rituals, false sense of prestige, unnatural social distinctions and class barriers. They are not attached to old Schools of Thought that have proved unequal to the needs of changed and changing times, that have failed to respond to the call of the hour. They are keenly sensible of the damage that has been and is being done to the Country's cause by the narrow-visioned policies of the Elders. Their unsophisticated minds are yet receptive. They want enlightened policies demonstrably in the Country's interests and capable of achieving the Country's goal of Freedom—which the policies of the Elders are not. They want a fresh programme, a clear level-headed programme, above all a simple programme, which all can understand, approve, and adopt without restriction or distinction,—which a Caste-Hindu or an Untouchable, a Sikh, a Muslim, a Christian, or a Parsee, man and woman, can equally effectively adopt as his or her own: a programme which, being crystal clear, leaves no loopholes for misunderstanding, misinterpretation, or—in plain words—for mischief, in any shape or form.

Such a programme I have attempted to provide in the two FORMULAS embodied in this work—The COMMUNAL FORMULA and the POLITICAL FORMULA. It will be observed that they are simply arranged, comprising a series of suggested solutions for declared differences. They are simple, workable, commonsense solutions of the differences as they are understood by the common people. They do not go counter to any theological or other beliefs of any community. Where such beliefs and usages are affected, the right of the community concerned to hold such beliefs and to follow such usages is admitted. The suggested solutions admit such rights where they exist, and only suggest a *via media*, a middle course, and a *modus operandi*, a manner of working, whereby such rights could be exercised without infringement and at the same time without hurting the susceptibilities of sister communities. The FORMULAS will be found to be simply worded, and to the point. The basic principle underlying the solutions is the principle of COMPROMISE—according to the teaching of the Holy Quran—THE GOLDEN MEAN. It is a principle which young hearts can readily understand and which they can readily reciprocate. I have seen Muslim and Hindu boys, Muslim and Hindu young men greeting each other with a warm hearty handshake. I have seen du and

Muslim boys, Hindu and Muslim young men engaged in earnest conversation, or strolling in gardens or on playgrounds, with their hands resting on each other's shoulders—neighbourliness, friendliness, brotherliness, all personified in that simple act of the handshake and the leaning on friendly shoulders. I have not seen such human contact, such human expression of natural human feelings, among our Elders. Hence my hope, my faith, in our Youth. It is our Youth alone in whom I see the Country's future rests. It is our Youth who will readily catch the message of COMRADESHIP that I have attempted to breathe into every line and every word of the FORMULAS. They may or may not appeal to our Elders. If they appeal to our Youth, that will be an incalculable gain for the Country. The ultimate goal of Freedom may take time to be reached, but the path our Youth will be following along the line of these Formulas will be the straightest and therefore the shortest path to the goal. There will be no losing of the way, no bickerings and antagonisms among the travellers: hand in hand they will march, Muslims, Caste and non-Caste Hindus, Sikhs, Christians, Parsees, all will march together to the goal: and no power on earth will be able to withhold Freedom from an India so united when United India will speak with one voice, demand but one demand—Freedom. A noble Destiny awaits our Youth. May the appeal of this little effort of mine reach their simple, honest hearts and evoke a generous response: may it help to guide their steps towards the fulfilment of that Destiny. May our common Creator who shapes the destinies of nations bless their youthful hearts, and grant them the strength, the light, and the faith, to strive in Unity and win their Freedom.

There are some malignant diseases which call for desperate remedies. A prolonged struggle, repeated failures, and a persisting Deadlock have reduced our countrymen to a state of lethargy and listlessness—resignation, the Easterner's last resort and refuge—Kismet, Karma. People go through their daily round of duties taking little interest in affairs. They know that the war is still on, but it has little interest for them: to them it is just one of several evils they must endure: there is little political activity noticeable in the Country: even our Leaders seem to have given up the struggle—their statements appear to be getting so stale and lifeless. Our Rulers have evidently decided to make no further move while the war is on, and we appear to have, in effect, acquiesced in their decision. A sense of frustration pervades the Country. In our uphill climb towards our political goal we seem to have rolled back by decades!

As the day follows the night, an awakening must come. When it comes, will it find us helpless, hopeless, as the Deadlock has left us?

It seems we must reconcile ourselves to the position that until the war is over there will be no resumption of activity in the political field. (a) This need not prove an unmixed evil. If we can utilise this enforced rest in exploring the possibilities of evolving inter-communal agreement, the time and the effort will not have been spent in vain.

This little work is one such effort. It is an effort to get our countrymen to resume interest in affairs and begin with setting their house in order. It endeavours to rouse them from their lethargy and listlessness, and, in doing so, it may on occasions be found to be administering to them a rude shake-up. I am aware I do not command the polished language of a polished politician. Plain words often sound harsh. If my words sound harsh, I request my readers to believe me that I have no intention or desire to hurt any one's feelings. As I have observed in the course of this work, I am no believer in sugar-coating bitter pills. There are occasions in our affairs which call for a plain word plainly spoken, and the failure to say that plain word would amount to a failure in one's duty. There would of course be ways and ways of speaking that 'plain' word. For instance, if men acted like asses, A would think it would be in their interest that they should be told "Gentlemen, you have been acting like asses," while B would perhaps tell them that their actions resembled those of the noble animal that had the honour of being associated with great personages of all ages and that there was convincing evidence that they possessed all the esteemable qualities for which that amiable animal had been justly famous! While both modes of address would convey the same meaning, those who would be prepared to condone the latter might yet declare the former to be highly offensive. In going through this work my readers will come across several occasions calling for the 'plain' word. I have felt they demanded that the 'plain' word should not only be spoken plainly, but that it should also be so spoken that it should reach *straight home*! Throughout this work I have endeavoured to keep this end in view, and, in speaking the 'plain' word whenever called for, I have scrupulously avoided harsh language and restricted myself strictly within the bounds of absolutely fair criticism. The reader will come across plenty of criticism in these pages, but I trust he will observe I have not criticised men, but only their policies, their actions and their results: and he will further observe that all criticism is invariably followed by constructive suggestions. Even so, if I happen to have said anything anywhere which might even remotely

(a) Since the above was written, the following Reuter's message from New York, dated 28th August 1943, was published in the *Daily Gazette*, Karachi, dated the 29th idem:—Mr. Brendan Bracken, British Minister of Information, questioned on the India situation, said that the political issue had been put in cold storage for the duration of the war but "Britain stands solemnly pledged to India and these pledges will be fulfilled in every respect. India was a great base which could not be allowed to become a scene of political controversy which would impair the war effort."

appear to be unfair to any one, I would ask him to accept my sincere apologies and my assurance that I bear no ill will towards any of my fellow-countrymen: that in all that I have said in this book I have had no intention or desire to hurt any one's feelings: that I respect and love all my countrymen alike: that in my reverence for and gratitude to our great Patriot-Leaders I am second to none among all my countrymen: and that in placing my effort before the Country my sole aim and desire have been to help my Countrymen, to my poor capacity, in realising their Destiny. I have endeavoured to point the way and to clear the path: whether they will or will not adopt it will be for them to judge—the decision must rest with them.

I am indebted to my nephew, Mr. Homi K. Wadia, for very valuable help in the printing of this work.

My thanks are due to my friend, Mr. M. S. M. Sharma, the Editor of 'The Daily Gazette', Karachi, for invaluable assistance in various directions.

I am also indebted to Mr. Syed Abdullah Brelvi, the Editor of 'The Bombay Chronicle' and the President of The All-India Newspaper Editors' Conference, for kindly contributing a Foreword to this work.

BOMBAY

23rd March, 1944.

J. F. KOTEWAL.

CONTENTS

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTION	i
PART — I — YESTERDAY.	
CHAP.	1
1. DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS.	3
Among the Masses and the Classes	3
Among the Muslim Masses	4
The Indian National Congress-Principles & Objects	4
The Congress on the Rights of Minorities	6
The Congress on Fundamental Rights	7
Economic and Social Programme of the Congress	8
The All-India Muslim League—CREED	8
" " " " —Pakistan Resolution.. .. .	10
" " " " —Constructive Programme	12
The All-India Hindu Mahasabha—Aims and Objects	13
The Hindu Party	13
The All-India Hindu Mahasabha—On Future Constitution	14
Hindutva—Mahasabha a National Organisation?	14
2. POLITICAL GOAL FOR INDIA	16
AS ENVISAGED BY BRITAIN	16
Queen Victoria's Proclamation, 1858	16
Declarations of 1917 and 1929	17
Before the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Indian Reforms	17
Lord Irwin in America in 1932	17
Mr. Amery on India's Political Goal	17
From '50 FACTS ABOUT INDIA'	18
The Charter that did not apply to India—The Atlantic Charter	18
Mr. Churchill on the Charter <i>vis-a-vis</i> India	19
AS ENVISAGED BY INDIANS	19
By the Congress	19
By the All-India Hindu Mahasabha	20
By the All-India Muslim League	20
By the All-India Depressed Classes	20
The Goal of the "Oppressed and Exploited Masses"	20
PART — II — TODAY	
1. CURRENT HISTORY	25
Mr. Amery on the Indian Constitutional Deadlock	25
Mr. Amery on 'INDIA FIRST'	28
Mr. Amery on the Need for Wider Unity.. .. .	31
Mahatma Gandhi's Rejoinder—'Withdraw and we shall Unite'	31
Mr. Amery Again	32
Mr. Amery on 'THE MAJOR ISSUE'	32
The Dream of a Muslim India	33
Oracles—Old and New	34
The British Government	35
How a Turkish Journalist looks at it	35

CHAP.

PAGE.

PART II, Chap. 1 (Cont.)

The Princes' Views on the Transfer of Power Under Federation
—1935

The Congress Attitude towards the States	36
Federation and Paramountcy	37
The Princes and Dominion Status	38

2. THE POSITION TODAY 42

The Constitutional Deadlock in India (Mr. Amery)

The Congress Position	42
The League's Position	42
The Position of the Scheduled Castes	43
The Position of the Princes	43

SOME DATES 43

Great Expectations—The Cripps Mission 43

The Princes on the Eve of the Cripps Mission 43

The Cripps Proposals 44

The Mission Fails 46

Rejection by the Congress 46

Rejection by the Mahasabha 48

Rejection by the Hindu Depressed Classes 50

Rejection by the Sikhs 50

Rejection by the League 51

The Tide Turns 51

FRUSTRATION 51

The Bus that was Missed 56

The Hindu Mahasabha Plan for Settlement 56

Mr. Churchill on the Settled Policy of the British Government 58

Mr. Amery on British Rule in India 58

Mr. Brailsford on the Future 63

WE MEAN TO HOLD OUR OWN—Mr. Churchill 66

Mr. Jinnah reiterates conditions precedent to League support 66

Postponement of Solution of Deadlock not fatal—Dr. Ambedkar.. 66

Non-Party Leaders favour Pakistan 67

The Viceroy on the Geographical Unity of India 67

The Mahasabha 'walks into the parlour' 68

The Caravan moves on 69

The Muslim Mind 69

The Cup of Bitterness 71

The League warns the British Government 71

The Ahrars on Independence 71

'Divide first and then take,' or 'take first and then divide' 74

Momins to join the League! 75

Mr. Amery Replies! 75

All-India Scheduled Classes Federation—'The stand we take' 76

The Quaid-i-Azam invites the Mahatma to write to him 73-78

The Mahatma writes, but the letter is not allowed to reach destination! 76

The Government explain 76

What Mr. Jinnah expected 77

Portents! 78

CHAP.

PAGE.

PART II, Chap. 2 (Cont.)

The Caravan continues to drift	80
Viscount Wavell on the Indian Political Problem	80a
• League appoints a Committee of Action	80a
Amery must go—Mahasabha	80b
Mahasabha appoints a Committee to investigate Hindu Grievances against Muslim Governments	80b
Minds made up—Jinnah	80c
With whom am I to negotiate—Jinnah	80d
“NO MAN CAN ALTER GEOGRAPHY” Viscount Wavell	80e
Mr. Jinnah on “THE WAY OUT”	80i
Dr. Latif on Mr. Jinnah’s “WAY OUT”	80k
“CONCEDE PAKISTAN AND WIN THE WAR”—Jinnah	80l

PART—III—THE COMMUNAL QUESTION

1. THE COMMUNITIES IN THE PAST.	83
‘Communalism an old Indian Problem’—The Verdict of History	83 •
2. THE COMMUNITIES IN THE PRESENT.	85
(i) Similarities between Hindus and Muslims	85
(ii) Difference between Hindus and Muslims	85
Revivalism responsible for Diversities	86
Indian Temperament responsible for the present points of opposition between the Communities	86
Conflict of Political Interests	87
Conflict of Economic Interests	87
Divergence of Social Systems	87
Two Distinct Civilisations.	88
Hinduism and Islam are Social Codes governing Man’s Relations with his Neighbours	88
(iii) A Nation at war with itself—Ch. Afzal Haq	89
(iv) What the Muslims do not want.	90
(v) What the Muslims want.	92
(vi) Mr. Jinnah’s 14 Points—1928	92
(vii) Mr. Jinnah’s 11 Points—1938	98
(viii) The Hindu Depressed Classes Leader’s Conception of a Possible Muslim Alternative to Pakistan	94
The Harshes of Sounds	95
(ix) The League’s Charges against Congress Governments	95
(x) Mahasabha’s Charges against Muslim Governments	96
(xi) Our Muslim and Hindu Cultures—Our Hindu and Muslim Civilisations—Samples that Speak !.. ..	97
(xii) Our Self-Expression—A Sample	99
The Mahatma on Riots	101
(xiii) Our Self-Determination	102
Blow for Blow—Private Armies—Civil War !	102
With, Without, In spite !	102
Determined to Frustrate !	102
We shall not negotiate !	102
Swords will be unsheathed !	103

CHAP.	PAGE.
PART III (Cont.)	
3. OUR UNTOUCHABLES (May The Lord Forgive Us).	104
Slaves and Sub-slaves	104
The Hindu Untouchables	105
The Hindu Caste System—Its Demerits	105
The Merits of Caste	106
The Future of Caste	107
'I have not caused the Differentiation'	110
Removal of Untouchability—The Mahasabha, 1932	111
" " " —The All India Hindu League	111
" " " —The All India Womens' Conference	112
" " " —The All India Youth Conference	112
Hindu Sangathan	113
Shuddhi	114
A New Religion for the People of God!	114
So sang Kabir	115
Dharma Sabhas	118
Our Muslim Depressed Classes	119
The Malechchhas	121
The Problem and Its Solution	121
4. COMMUNAL UNITY—SUGGESTIONS.	124
The All-India Unity Conference, 1924	124
Communal Unity—As viewed by the All-India Women's Conference, 1940	125
If People are to Live Happily Together	125
Some Points of Difference Between the Communities	126
(i) The COW QUESTION.	
The Hindu View—Point	128
The Cow in Hindu Mythology	128
Diet in the Vedic Period	129
The Cow in the Hindu Dharma	129
The Cow in Arthashastra	129
The Congress Approach to the Question	130
The attitude of the Hindu Mahasabha	130
The Muslim View-Point	131
Of a young Muslim Friend	131
Of a Muslim Friend advanced in years	132
The Holy Qur'an—Sura XXII—Verse 28	133
" " " " " — " 32	133
" " " " " — " 33	133
" " " " " — " 34	134
" " " " " — " 35	134
" " " " " — " 36	135
" " " " " — " 37	135
SACRIFICE	136
The great sacrifice on the Great Festival—Idu'l Azha	136
Al-Baizawi on the teaching of the Holy Qur'an, (Sura XXII, 37)	136
In The Traditions	136
The teaching of the Hidayah regarding the nature and conditions of the Sacrifice	137

CHAP.	PAGE.
PART III, Chap. 4 (Cont.)	
Sacrifice—Commemorative	
Self-Dedicatory	
Eucharistic	139
• Sacrifice on the birth of a child—Aqiqah	139
The Dabistan on Cow Flesh as Diet	140
Aba Musa Mash'ari „ „ „ „	140
SOME SUGGESTIONS	140
A VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT OF AMITY AND CONCORD	146
(ii) THE AZAN—THE MUSLIM CALL TO PRAYER	147
The Muslim Grievance according to the Pirpur Report	147
The AZAN—Text and Translation	147
Comments	149
A VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT OF AMITY AND CONCORD.	151
(iii) MUSIC BEFORE MOSQUES	152
The Muslim Grievance according to the Pirpur Report	152
The Mahasabha on the question	152
What the Law says	153
A VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT OF AMITY AND CONCORD.	155
(iv) The LANGUAGE QUESTION—URDU vs. HINDI	156
The Urdu Language—Its Origin	156
The Muslim View	157
The Hindu View	157
The Congress View	157
Prof. Beni Prasad on the Bi-Lingual argument	158
on the Script.	159
In Switzerland	159
on Naturalism	160
THE MUSLIMS' GRIEVANCES AND THEIR REMEDIES	161
(a) Grievance—Exclusion of Urdu as a Medium of Instruction.	161
Remedy	161
(b) Grievance—Unwillingness to open Urdu Schools	161
Remedy	162
(c) Grievance—Religious Instruction for Muslims in schools and colleges—Closing down of Muslim schools—Insistence on Muslim students adopting Hindu modes of salutation—(Namaste—Ramji-ki-jai)—Insistence on Muslim students joining in Prasthana	163
Remedy	165
(d) Grievance—Grant to a Hindu communal college against stoppage of grants to Muslim secondary schools	165
Remedy	165
(e) Grievance—Abolition of Selection Committees restricts admission of Muslim students to Arts and Professional Colleges	166
Remedy	166
(f) Grievance—In Malabar the amalgamation of special schools with general schools threatens extinction of Moplah schools	166
Remedy	166

CHAP.

PAGE.

PART III. Chap. 4 (Cont.)

(g)	Grievance—In Malabar the abolition of Conductors and Conductresses in Moplah schools and restriction on employment of Arabic Pundits in high schools—a set-back to the education of Moplahs..	166
	Remedy ..	167
(h)	Grievance—Communal discrimination in the grant of exemption from school fees ..	167
	Remedy ..	167
(i)	Grievance—Constitution of Compulsory Education Area, Government bearing expenditure subject to medium of instruction being Hindi only ..	168
	Remedy ..	168
(j)	Grievance—Systematic forcing of Hindu culture and religion on Muslims ..	168
	Remedy ..	168
(k)	Grievance—Viddia Mandir Scheme objectionable ..	168
	Remedy ..	169
(l)	Grievance—Communal bias in text books ..	170
	Remedy ..	170
(m)	Grievance—Applications in Urdu rejected by municipal boards:..	170
	Remedy ..	170
(n)	Grievance—Use of Urdu in Law-Courts handicapped ..	170
	Remedy ..	170
(o)	Grievance—Use of Urdu in Legislatures handicapped ..	170
	Remedy ..	170
(v)	THE NATIONAL ANTHEM FOR INDIA ..	170
	The Muslims' objections to the Bande Mataram ..	171
	The Muslim League's Lucknow Resolution, 1937 ..	171
	The Question of Questions ..	172
	A substitute—A SOLEMN AFFIRMATION ..	173
(vi)	THE NATIONAL FLAG FOR INDIA ..	173
	The Congress Tri-colour and the Muslim view-point ..	173
	The League Flag and the Delhi March-Past, April 1943 ..	174
	Do slaves have flags? ..	174
	We do not want flags—We want Freedom ..	175
(vii)	INTER-COMMUNAL SOCIAL INTERCOURSE ..	175
	The Muslim view-point ..	175
	Hindu treatment of Muslims as Untouchables ..	176
	No ill-feeling behind ill-treatment ..	176
	In Pre-British days ..	176
	A shrewd analysis of the Muslim mind ..	177
	The Malechchha and the Kaffir ..	178
	Messengers of Hope and Cheer ..	179
	Solemn Assurances ..	179

PART — IV — THE POLITICAL QUESTION P A K I S T A N

1.	WESTERN DEMOCRACY AND INDIAN MUSLIMS ..	183
	Small Nation-States—Lord Acton ..	183
	The one test of democratic governments—Mehta and Patwardhan..	183

CHAP.	PAGE.
PART IV—Chap. 1 (Cont.)	
Do away with communal parties—Dr. Paranjpye ..	184
Western Democracy unsuitable for India—Mr. Jinnah ..	184
Two Basic Principles—Moulana Abul Kalam Azad ..	189
The Basic Question for Indian Muslims —Do- ..	191
Thus spake Jinnah	193
2. PAKISTAN DEFINED	195
The Land of the Paks	195
Two Federations—Muslim and Non-Muslim ..	195
Bengalee Nationalism	196
Seven Schemes of Pakistan	198
Independent Afghan State	198
Pakistan Caliphate	199
League's Pakistan Resolution of 1940	199
Daru'l Harb—The Land of Warfare	201
Daru'l Islam—The Land of Islam	202
Daru'l Harb & Daru'l Islam-Wahhabi interpretation ..	202
3. PAKISTAN—VIEWS FOR AND AGAINST ..	205
PROS—No basis for Hindu-Muslim Unity:	
Cultural Differences	205
Opposed Economic Interests	207
Financially the Scheme Sound	207
Muslim Countries in favour of Separation ..	210
The Idea of Separation has regularly developed ..	212
The Muslims claim to be a Nation	212
The distinction between a Community and a Nation ..	212
The Rights of a Community and the Rights of a Nation ..	212
Muslim National Home—Muslim National State ..	213
Two Indias—Mr. Patrick Lacy	214
Hindus and Sikhs in Pakistan	216
Azad Punjab	216
The Hindu is Hindu & The Muslim is Muslim, and Ne'er the Twain shall meet—Malik Barkat Ali ..	217
Inspiration and Motivating Force behind Pakistan —Barkat Ali	218
Pakistan adopted by the Sind Legislative Assembly ..	220
CONS—Political Unity of All-India !	220
Conception of a Divided India not Islam's Conception of India To Be	221
No Disintegration—No Vivisection—The All-India National League	224
The All-India Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European Association	224
The National Liberal Federation of India	224
The All-India Hindu Mahasabha	225
Sikhs and Pakistan.	
The All-India Akali Conference	225
The Khalsa National Party	225
We shall not be dominated by others—Sardar Baldev Singh	226
Unsheathing of swords—Sir Jogendra Singh ..	226

CHAP.

PAGE.

PART IV—Chap. 3 (Cont.)

The Culture Argument and Safeguards—Dr. Abdul Latif	..	226
The Azad (Independent) Muslim Conference	..	227
Our destinies are linked together—Sir S. Sultan Ahmed	..	229
The All-India Depressed Classes Conference	..	231
The Muslim Majlis	..	231
South-India Anti-Separation Conference	..	231
Division of India, no salvation—Mr. Mahomed Yusuff Shareef	..	232
The Anti-Communal Conference	..	233
Unity and a single Nationhood—Sir Mirza M. Ismail	..	234

SOME LIKELY PHASES OF PAKISTAN IN OPERATION .. 235

Separation and safeguards will not go together !	..	235
Other matters for the Muslims to consider	..	235
Mr. Savarkar's reaction to the Pakistan Resolution of the Sind Legislative Assembly	..	237

4. LET THERE BE PAKISTAN .. 239

Satan himself could not speak better	..	239
Asses that went to governments	..	240
The glory of government—Malik Barkat Ali	..	240
To reign is worth ambition	..	241
A strong case	..	241
Typical Pakistanis !	..	242
The ultimate end and the last resort	..	243
Let us then accept Pakistan—in principle: Let us accept it here and now	..	243
The transitional stage	..	243
Willing agreement of Hindus: Else—	..	244
I will be wise enough not to care a fig for it	..	244
Let us, first and last, be just to each other—EL HAMZA	..	244

PART V — THE INDIA CHARTER .. 245**THE GOLDEN MEAN** .. 247**WE HAVE BEEN WARNED !** .. 248**Pakistan—A Circle of Stagnation—Beni Prasad** .. 248**What is Independence? H. N. Brailsford** .. 249**The Dominion Pattern** .. 249**Could India stand alone?** .. 250**The right hands of armed men** .. 251**Ramparts of Independence** .. 251**The background** .. 252**An Asiatic League!** .. 253**Long-range tendencies** .. 254**In a rational and kindly world** .. 255**The two words** .. 256**1. INTRODUCTORY** .. 257**Not one practical or constructive solution—Lord Linlithgow** .. 257**The Agreed Plan—** .. 258**Communal Formula—Equality** .. 258

CHAP.

PAGE

PART V (Cont.)

Political Formula—Freedom, the Goal: Unity, the Path	..	258
This Freedom	..	259
Relations with Britain	..	259
Agreement on Preliminaries	..	260
The Tests	..	260
The Light, and Seeing Eyes	..	260
Times and Climes and Charters of Liberty and Rights	..	261

2. EXPLANATORY 262

An Independent Federation	..	262
Accession of Provinces and States	..	262
Under the Cripps Plan	..	262
The Congress View	..	263
Under the Plan of our Charter	..	264
Equality, the basic principle	..	264
Residuary Powers	..	265
Franchise	..	265
Relations with Britain	..	265
Revision of the Constitution	..	267

3. MAXIMS 268

Forget	..	268
Remember	..	268

4. PRINCIPLES 269

Muslims and United India (Pakistan)	..	269
States and United India	..	269
Inter-Communal Relations	..	269
States and the British Crown	..	270
United India and Britain	..	270
United India and External Relations	..	270
The War	..	270

5. THE STATE 272

Its Composition	..	272
Its Status	..	272
Its Sovereignty to rest in the Federal House of Representatives	..	272
The Council of Five (PUNCH)	..	272
The SUR-PUNCH	..	272
Composition Of The Federation Of United India	..	273

6. THE CONSTITUTION-MAKING BODY 274

Its Constitution	..	274
Its Composition	..	275
Conduct of Business	..	275
Function	..	275

7. CONSTITUTION 276

Accession of Acceding Members	..	276
The Legislatures	..	276

CHAP.

PAGE.

PART V, Chap. 7 (Cont.)

Life of Legislatures	276
Franchise	277
Electorates	277
Representation on Legislatures (Federal)	277
First Elections				
Federal House of Representatives	278
Provincial and States Houses of Representatives	279
Conduct of Business	279
Federal House—Council of Five (PUNCH)	279
Speakers	279
Prime Ministers	279
Cabinets :				
Federal	280
Provincial and States	280
Conventions :				
In matters affecting religion or personal law	280
Collective Responsibility	281
Powers and Functions	281
Residuary Powers	281
Federal Court,	}	281
Federal Railway Authority,		
Reserve Bank				
Revision of Constitution	281
Secession of Acceding Members	282
Relations with Britain on the Termination of the First Treaty	282
Dissolution of Federation	282
Pakistan	282
3. FUNDAMENTALS—THAT SHALL BE INCORPORATED IN THE CONSTITUTION	284
(A) Fundamental Rights of the Citizens of United India	285
(B) THE TREATY OF PERPETUAL PEACE AND CONCORD BETWEEN THE MUSLIMS AND THE HINDUS OF UNITED INDIA. (THE COMMUNAL FORMULA)	286
VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS OF AMITY AND CONCORD				
(a) Cow Sacrifice and Cow Protection	286
(b) The Azan—The Muslim Call to Prayer	287
(c) Music before Mosques	287
(d) The Language Question—Urdu vs. Hindi, also Education and Educational Institutions	288
(e) The National Anthem	291
(f) The National Flag	292
(g) Inter-Communal Social Intercourse	292
(h) Maintenance of Law and Order :	293
(1) Registration of Bad Characters	293
(2) Maintenance of Order	293
(3) Processions	294
(4) Breaches of the Peace	294
Local Committees	295

CHAP.

PAGE.

PART V—chap. 8 (Cont.)

(C) MANDATE TO THE FIRST FEDERAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE PRINCIPLES OF A TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN UNITED INDIA AND BRITAIN..	296
TREATY WITH BRITAIN	296
Life of the Treaty	296
Fiscal Relations	296
Commerce	296
Financial Commitments	296
International Agreements and Obligations	297
Entry into and Movement within United India	297
Military Assistance	297
Political	298
War	298

9. ESSENTIALS—THAT SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR IN THE CONSTITUTION	300
Renunciation by Certain Communities	300
Communal Electorates	300
Communal Representation (on Local Bodies, and Provincial and State Legislatures)	301
Communal Proportion in Services	301
THE STATES	302
Administration	302
State-Groups and Sub-Groups	302
Electoral Colleges	302
States' Treaties with the Paramount Power	303
Laws	303
Privy Purse	303
Rights of Subjects	303
The Press	303
Taxation	303
Customs, Excise, etc.	303
Representative Institutions	303
Breakdown	304
10. OPTIONALS	305
DOMINION STATUS	305
TEACH US TO LIVE AS COMRADES ALL	306

PART—VI—TO THOSE CONCERNED .. 307

1. TO OUR BRITISH RULERS	309
Lord Irwin on United India, 1932	309
Trusteeship	309
The MA-BAP Tradition that was	310
Goals and Promises	312
Mr. Churchill on the Liquidation of the Empire	313
British Rule—Benefits—Inequities !	313

CHAP.

PAGE.

PART—VI Chap. 1 (*Cont.*)

Future Choice, India's—Present, Britain's	313
Keeping old memories green	314
Hobgoblin of little minds	314
Dying with the Sun	314
We are not fit to receive and preserve Freedom	314
The instinct of self-interest : an appeal	315
What will you choose ?	315
 2. TO OUR PRINCES	317
The Golden Age—The happiest government	317
A command performance ?	318
A fifteenth wheel?	318
Hanauz Delhi Door Ast!	319
Are we Indians ?	319
Political Advance contemplated by the Princes	319
The Princes' View-Point	320
The View-Point of the States' Subjects	320
The attitude of His Majesty's Government in the matter of constitutional changes in the States	322
The Triple Obligations of the Princes to the Crown, their States and to India	323
Mr. Amery on the meaning of 'India First' to the Princes	325
Basic Tests	325
Future Policy of the States	326
Freedom, as envisaged by the Princes on the eve of the Cripps Mission	326
Mahatma Gandhi on the place of the Princes in the post-war world	327
Our greatest asset	327
The Pace	327
The Princes' Outlook	327
The Viceroy's 'Graver' Note	328
The 'GRAVEST' Note	328
Can the Princes fit into an Indian Federation?	329
Our analysis of the Problem	332
Our Formula safeguards the Princes' interests	333
Also of their Subjects	334
Also of the States <i>vis-a-vis</i> other Units of Federation	335
Also of the States in relation to the Crown	335
The Bapoo and his children	335
Bapoos and Bapoos	336
The Princes' part in United India	336
Fair and dispassionate examination	337
The Choice	337
A great Responsibility	338
A Declaration	338
What the Motherland expects of her Princely Sons	339
 3. TO OUR PRINCES' SUBJECTS	340
Of Democracy	340
Tottering Feet—Lilliputian Eyes—Flying Horses	342

CHAP.	PAGE.
PART—VI Chap. 3 (Cont.)	
Modern Democratic Theory	342
The Gurujee—Wagons hitched to the Congress Star ..	345
The Barrier—The 'Under-dog'—the wagons stand still ..	345
Is it the right Goal—Is it the right Path ..	346
The Princes' resentment	346
The Eternal Question	347
This Goal—and that—of THE INDIA CHARTER ..	347
Utopia! and yet—	348
A Declaration	348
This our Goal—This our Path	348
The wagon rumbles on	349
Why wait for the Princes?	349
We fly	349
4. TO OUR MINORITIES—OUR 'IMPORTANT' MINORITIES ..	350
Where a Thesaurus failed	350
At the distribution of good things	350
Fortune's favourites	350
Worldly Wisdom—or—Patriotism!	351
An arrangement of Equality, and arguments in its support' ..	352
Advisers	353
A Renunciation—A Voluntary Sacrifice	353
Its Advantages, and its only Disadvantage	354
A Call !	354
An Announcement	354
The Race for Sacrifice and Honour	355
5. TO OUR MEN OF DESTINY—OUR MUSLIM NATION OF INDIA ..	356
Our Depressed Classes	356
We are a Nation	356
Suppose Pakistan is established today	356
Safeguards for Minorities	357
Legal Sanction—Goodwill	357
The sine-qua-non	357
Quadrupeds that point a moral	357
When parties fight	358
Chaman—or—Jahannam ?	358
A workable arrangement !	359
Adopt the Golden Mean	359
A Formula of Compromise—Our Communal Formula ..	360
A Code of Conduct for Men of Honour	360
Be Moderate in Thy Pace !	360
Our Duty	360
A Formula of Moderation—Our Political Formula ..	361
What it provides for us—What it expects of us ..	361
The Call for us—India's Men of Destiny ! ..	362
What is to be her Destiny? What is to be your Destiny? ..	362
6. NEMESIS ? KARMA ?	
TO OUR HAPLESS MAJORITY—	
OUR HINDU COMMUNITY—	
OUR HINDU NATION }	363

PART—VI Chap. 6 (Cont.)

Procreation in Captivity	363
Slaves of Slaves !	363
Great Expectations	363
Sub-Slaves and Co-Slaves	363
Nemesis! Karma!	364
If I put India First—Mr. Amery's Questions	364
Karma's Further Question !	364
COMPROMISE—The Answer	365
Examine your Position	365
The Courses Open	366
Which shall we choose?	366
The View of the Muslim Proletariat	367
What would you lose ?	367
What would you gain?	367
Can Vivisection of India be prevented? By Physical Force?	367
Or, by Altered Conditions?	368
Prayashchitta!	368
A word on Democracy	368
A Fetish?	368
Is Democracy to have no place in our life?	369
Rule by the People—Can it be achieved?	369
Democracy that would suit our genius	369
The Great Sacrifice—The Greater Compensation—Liberty, Equality, Fraternity	369
Are we prepared to face the Ordeal ?	370
Via our Political Formula?	370
Our Communal Formula—A Code of Conduct— <i>Mutatis Mutandis</i>	370
What we owe to Posterity	370
 7. TO OUR ELDERS.	 371
Patriots All	372
The Detached Eye	372
The Man in the Street	372
Problems and Approaches	372
The People of God & my Twice Born Elders	372
Malechchhas—Kaffirs	373
Divide et Impera	373
Many Voices	373
The Oppositions	374
The Question of Questions	374
Pawn against Pawn	375
To Mr. Jinnah	375
To Mr. Savarkar	376
To Mahatmajee	376
The Gandhian Congress must Die	377
Dissolve it or Reform it	377
If it is to survive	377
A re-orientation of policy	378
Win back the Congress from yourself and from itself	378
If the Fates have willed—	378
It were best the prisons held their own	378

PART-VI (Cont.)

CHAP. 7 (Cont.)

PAGE.

The Cripps Mission and after	378
The position before us	379
Getting together	380
Pause for a moment	381
Wisdom speaks	381
Dar-ul-Hakh, Dar-ul-Islam, Dar-ul-Aman.	383
Equal Partnership	383
Magnanimity, the Trust-Wisdom	384
Plighted Faith	384
The Fellowship of United India	384
Are we Cowards?	385
No need to part company	385
Mr. Jinnah, Trust Mr. Savarkar	385
Mr. Savarkar, Trust Mr. Jinnah	385
Your Blessings, Mahatmajee	385
8. TO OUR YOUTH.	386
The Spirit of Don Quixote	386
Education and Eternal Values—	Sir S. Radhakrishnan	386
Indian Culture	386
A New Way of Life	386
A mental picture	387
We are Friends to All-India	387
As I see you	389
Our Politicians	389
Their followings	390
'You belong to me and I belong to you'—Jinnah	390
Not fair of them	390
What a grand vista meets the eye of Youth!	391
Your answer	391
This our Visions—This our Goal	391
Think for yourselves—then Act	392
Your armour	393
To those at schools and colleges	393
Your article of faith	394
To the last day of your mortal life	394
To those who have entered upon Life's struggle	394
Very much to the point—Military Careers—Panna Lal	394
To those who hear the CALL...	395
Respond like men	396
9. A SUMMING UP	397
A Summing Up	397
Crash your way through	400
The way out	400
Your Duty before God	400
No greater shame and disgrace—No lower rung of cowardice and dishonour—	400
The will-o'-the-wisp	401
Parties to the Tangle	401
The Call for each—the Call of Duty	401
If we know ourselves	401

PART—VI (Cont.)

CHAP. 9 (Cont.)

PAGE.

ACTION ORDER 401

COMMUNAL

The Caste-Hindus do declare.. .. . 401

The Harijans do declare 402

The Hindus, Caste and Non-Caste, do declare 402

The Muslims do declare 402

POLITICAL

The Parsees do announce 403

The other Smaller Minorities do announce 403

The Princes do announce 403

The States Subjects do announce 403

The Hindus do declare 403

The Muslims do declare 403

A Joint Communication 403

If the Muslims decide on a different course 404

We agree to Pakistan—Frame your proposals—Let us have
a complete picture 404

Are you agreeable to the Communal Formula?.. .. . 404

If the Princes stand out 404

Open Doors 404

So, Forward let us March, Friends 404

10. AT THE BAR OF HISTORY 405

The Winds that Scatter 405

A Palace of Justice 405

Those in the Dock 405

The Charge—High Treason against Humanity 405

As Humanity's Spokesman, I indict you 405

Mr. Winston Churchill, Mr. Leopold Amery, the British
Parliament and People, and the British Community in
India, of the period 1939-43 405Mahatma Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, and the Members
of the Indian National Congress Cabinet of the period
1939-43 406

Mr. Mahomed Ali Jinnah and Mr. Vinayak Damodar Savarkar. 407

The Indian Intelligentsia of the period 1939-43 407

The Verdict of History—GUILTY 408

EPILOGUE 409

Invisible chords of blood and memory 411

The mysterious music of Hindustan 411

To what land shall I turn—Wither shall I go? 411

Where does India stand? 411

What of the British Government? 412

The Caravan moves— 412

Who will break the Circle? 412

With whom rests the responsibility? 412

What is the Empire worth? 412

Our only concern 412

What moral justification? 412

False Gods! 413

PART—VI (Cont.)

EPILOGUE (Cont.)

PAGE.

So will Posterity judge them	413
The Muslims must realise	413
The Hindus must realise	414
What will the Muslims choose ?	414
What will the Hindus choose ?	414
The choice for our Elders	414
Will Youth succeed where the Elders have failed ?	414
What is the answer to be ?	414
Let your actions speak your answer	414

TO YOUR DUTY, YOUNG INDIA !

APPENDICES—

I THE LUCKNOW PACT	417
II THE COMMUNAL AWARD, 1933	422
The Supplementary Award	425
The Poona Part	426
Opposition—The Hindu Maharabha	427, 429
The Anti-Communal Award Conference	428
The All Bengal Depressed Classes Conference	429
The National Liberal Federation of India	430
Support—The Communal Award Conference	428

TABLES OF SEATS—

Provincial Legislative Assemblies (under the Government of India Act, 1935)	431
The Federal Assembly (as provided in the Government of India Act, 1935)	432
Comparative Statement of Percentage of Muslim Seats to the Total Elected Members	433

III COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION ON LEGISLATURES & IN SERVICES.

Communal Representation in Services—Government of India Resolution—Ext. No. F-14/17-B/33 of 4-7-1934..	434
Further Concessions, 1943	437
Joint/Separate Electorates	438
Separate Electorates	438
Electorates and Services	438
Communal Electorates	439
The Search for Security	439

IV CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

Indian National Congress	442
The National Liberal Federation on Constitution—Framing Body	442
Dr. R. P. Paranjpye	443
Moulana Abul Kalam Azad	444
Azad Muslim Conference	444
Mr. Jinnah	445

V NATIONAL MINORITIES AND INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEES

VI THE CENSUS, 1941	446
	449

PART-1—YESTERDAY

CHAPTER I

DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS

Among the Masses and the Classes

"Centuries of subjection, the Hindu caste system, in many cases an inadequate diet, and finally the British domination, have all combined to keep these millions in the background. Peace and the pressure on the soil have also been great levellers. No longer can the ambitions of a Prince offer rewards for courage and skill at arms, irrespective of birth, while in the overcrowded districts the industrious peasant can hardly hope to raise himself by adding acre to acre. It would be impossible to write a history of any European country during the last two centuries without mentioning some who had begun life working on a farm or on a factory bench, but in India neither ryot nor craftsman have learnt to look upon the world as their oyster, and society remains static except in a few large Europeanised cities.

Generalisations about the mass of villagers and poorer townfolk, vague talk of their 'loyalty' or of their united demand for certain reforms, these must be dismissed as part of the stock-in-trade of politicians. Apart from the call of religion, itself illusive and indeterminate, it is doubtful whether any common purpose or sentiment animates the Maratha and the Lingaiyat of the West, the Muslim peasant of the Punjab or of Bengal, the sturdy Jat, the Tamil of Southern India, the Dogra of the northern hills. Territorial patriotism and feudal loyalties have never affected more than a small proportion of the population. It would be unwise to presume more about the villagers' political views than a certain weariness of a Government which after a century still remains alien and largely incomprehensible, which has failed to curb the money-lender, the landlord, and the policeman, or to ease the country's most pressing economic troubles. Personal feeling about the European is not an important factor. Outside the great cities only an infinitesimal part of the population is brought into contact with the English, and probably most Indians live and die without even seeing one. Recent events suggest that many parts of the country are ready to listen to an appeal, half religious and half political, so long as it comes from some one, like Mr. Gandhi, whom they can reverence personally, and who promises a way out of the economic depression in which they are sunk. If they do not take the lawyer type of politician very seriously, it is because they suspect him of being the ally of the money-lender and the landlord. It may well be that when future democratic leaders suggest revolutionary changes, social as well as economic, it will be the peasants who will support them, and the landlords, businessmen, and professional classes who will organise to circumvent them. This has already occurred in Ireland, where nationalism was once regarded as a middle-class movement." (a)

".....Whatever may be the form of democracy introduced in 1934, or evolved in the subsequent decade, the moulding of India's future will depend, as in other countries, upon the wealthy and the educated. It must be many years before the villager gains a direct and decisive voice in provincial and federal

(a) RISE AND FULFILMENT OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA by Edward Thompson and G. T. Garratt, pages 646-7.

affairs. Generalisations about the educated classes is dangerous, if not impertinent. At the lowest estimate they form a population of between ten and twenty millions always changing in outlook and rapidly increasing. It includes men and women of great ability, considerable achievement, and vast possibilities. For nearly all of them political nationalism remains the great motive force in spite of the temporary eclipse of the Congress party." (a)

Among the Muslim Masses

"There is thus a stagnation in the social life of the Muslims. But there is also a stagnation in the political life of the Muslim community of India. The Muslims have no interest in politics as such. Their predominant interest is religion. This can be easily seen by the terms and conditions that a Muslim constituency makes for its support to a candidate fighting for a seat. The Muslim constituency does not care to examine the programme of the candidate. All that the constituency wants from the candidate is that he should agree to replace the old lamps of the masjid by supplying new ones at his cost, to provide a new carpet for the masjid because the old one is torn, to repair the masjid because it has become dilapidated. In some places a Muslim constituency is quite satisfied if the candidate agrees to give a sumptuous feast and in other places if he agrees to buy votes at so much a piece. With the Muslims election is a mere matter of money and is very seldom a matter of social programme of general improvement. Muslim politics takes no note of purely secular categories of life, namely, the differences between rich and poor, capital and labour, landlord and tenant, priest and layman, reason and superstition. Muslim politics is essentially clerical and recognises only one difference, namely, that existing between Hindus and Muslims. None of the secular categories of life have any place in the politics of the Muslim community, and if they do find a place—and they must because they are irrepressible—they are subordinated to the one and only governing principle of the Muslim political universe, namely, religion." (b)

(a) THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

1885—The Congress was founded by Mr. Allan Octavian Hume, a retired member of the Indian Civil Service, and it held its first session in Bombay at Christmas of this year. The fundamental principles of the Congress were laid down to be:—

- Firstly, the fusion into one national whole of all the different and discordant elements that constitute the population of India;
- Secondly, the gradual regeneration, along all lines, mental, moral, social and political, of the nation thus evolved; and
- Thirdly, the consolidation of union between England and India by securing the modification of such of the conditions as may be unjust or injurious to the latter country.

1907—The Objects of the Congress were laid down as under:—

"The objects of the Indian National Congress are the attainment by the people of India of a system of Government similar to that enjoyed by the self-governing members of the

(a) RISE AND FULFILMENT OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA by Edward Thompson and G. T. Garratt, page 649.

(b) THOUGHTS ON PAKISTAN by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, pages 228-9.

British Empire,* and a participation* by them in the rights and responsibilities of the Empire on equal terms with those members. These objects are to be achieved by constitutional means by bringing about a steady reform of the existing system of administration and by promoting national unity, fostering public spirit and developing and organising the intellectual, moral, economic and industrial resources of the country."

1927—The Congress adopted INDEPENDENCE as the goal of India.

1928—At its 1928 Session the Congress, while adhering to Independence, agreed to accept Dominion Status if granted before the end of 1929.

1929—In the latter half of 1929 the Congress insisted on the immediate grant of Dominion Status or an assurance that Dominion Status would be the basis of discussion at the Round Table Conference to be convened in England between representatives of England and the two Indias.

At its 1929 Session the Congress declared for complete independence or 'Purna Swaraj.'

Article 1 of the Congress Constitution laying down the OBJECT of the Congress now reads:—

"The object of the Indian National Congress is the attainment by the people of India of PURNA SWARAJ (COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE) by all legitimate and peaceful means."

1935—36 Congress attitude towards the Government of India Act, 1935—

"Whereas the Government of India Act, 1935, which is based on the White Paper and the Joint Parliamentary Report and which is in many respects even worse than the proposals contained in them, in no way represents the will of the nation, and is designed to facilitate and perpetuate the domination and exploitation of the people of India and is imposed on the country to the accompaniment of widespread repression and the suppression of civil liberties, the Congress reiterates its rejection of the new constitution in its entirety.

The Congress, as representing the will of the Indian people for national freedom and a democratic state, declares that no constitution imposed by an outside authority and no constitution which curtails the sovereignty of the people of India and does not recognise their rights to shape and control fully their political and economic future can be accepted. In the opinion of the Congress such a constitution must be based on the independence of India as a nation and it can only be framed by a constituent assembly elected on adult franchise or a franchise which approximates to it as nearly as possible. The Congress, therefore, reiterates and stresses the demand for a constituent assembly in the name of the Indian people and calls upon its representatives and members in the Legislatures and outside to work for the fulfilment of this demand:"(a)

The Congress on the "Rights of Minorities"

Extract from the Presidential Address, Congress Session, February 1938:—

"Talking of Indian unity, the next thing that strikes us is the problem of the minorities. The Congress has, from time to time, declared its policy on this question. The latest authoritative pronouncement made by the All India Congress Committee at its meeting in Calcutta in October, 1937 runs thus:—

'The Congress has solemnly and repeatedly declared its policy in regard to the rights of the minorities in India and has stated that it considers it its duty to protect these rights and ensure the widest possible scope for the development of these minorities and their participation in the fullest measure in the political, economic and cultural life of the nation. The objective of the Congress is an independent and united India where no class or group or majority or minority may exploit another to its own advantage, and where all the elements in the nation may co-operate together for the common good and the advancement of the people of India. This objective of unity and mutual co-operation in a common freedom does not mean the suppression in any way of the rich variety and cultural diversity of Indian life, which have to be preserved in order to give freedom and opportunity to the individual as well as to each group to develop unhindered according to its capacity and inclination.

In view, however, of attempts having been made to misinterpret the Congress policy in this regard, the All India Congress Committee desire to reiterate this policy. The Congress has included in its resolution on FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS that

- (i) Every citizen of India has the right of free expression of opinion, the right of free association and combination and the right to assemble peacefully and without arms, for a purpose not opposed to law and morality.
- (ii) Every citizen shall enjoy freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess and practise his religion, subject to public order and morality.
- (iii) The culture, language and script of the minorities and of the different linguistic areas shall be protected.
- (iv) All citizens are equal before the law, irrespective of religion, caste, creed or sex.
- (v) No disability attaches to any citizen by reason of his or her religion, caste, creed or sex, in regard to public employment, office of power or honour, and in the exercise of any trade or calling.
- (vi) All citizens have equal rights and duties in regard to wells, tanks, roads, schools and places of public resort, maintained out of State or local funds or dedicated by private persons for the use of the general public.

*

*

*

(ix) The State shall observe neutrality in regard to all religions.

(x) The franchise shall be on the basis of universal adult suffrage.

- (xiv) Every citizen is free to move throughout India and to stay and settle in any part thereof, to acquire property and to follow any trade or calling, and to be treated equally with regard to legal prosecution or protection in all parts of India.

These clauses of the Fundamental Rights resolution make it clear that there should be no interference in matters of conscience, religion or culture, and a minority is entitled to keep its personal law without any change in this respect being imposed by the majority.

The position of the Congress in regard to the communal decision has been repeatedly made clear in Congress resolutions and finally in the Election Manifesto issued last year. The Congress is opposed to this decision as it is anti-national and anti-democratic and it is a barrier to Indian freedom and the development of Indian unity. Nevertheless, the Congress has declared that a change in or supersession of the Communal Decision should only be brought about by the natural (mutual!) agreement of the parties concerned. The Congress has always welcomed and is prepared to take advantage of any opportunity to bring about such a change by mutual agreement.

In all matters affecting the minorities in India, the Congress wishes to proceed by their co-operation and through their goodwill in a common undertaking and for the realisation of a common aim which is the freedom and betterment of all the people of India." (a)

The Congress on Fundamental Rights

The Congress resolution on Fundamental Rights reads as under:—

"This Congress is of opinion that, to enable the masses to appreciate what 'SWARAJ,' as conceived by the Congress, will mean to them, it is desirable to state the position of the Congress in a manner easily understood by them. In order to end the exploitation of the masses, political freedom must include real economic freedom of the starving millions. The Congress, therefore, declares that any constitution which may be agreed to on its behalf, should provide, or enable the Swaraj Government to provide, for the following:— (b)

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND DUTIES.

- (i) to (vi) as given above under "RIGHTS OF MINORITIES."
- (vii) Every citizen has the right to keep and bear arms, in accordance with regulations and reservations made in that behalf.
- (viii) No person shall be deprived of his liberty, nor shall his dwelling or property be entered, sequestered, or confiscated, save in accordance with the law.
- (ix) & (x) —as given above under "RIGHTS OF MINORITIES."
- (xi) The State shall provide free and compulsory primary education.
- (xii) The State shall confer no titles.
- (xiii) There shall be no capital punishment.
- (xiv) as given above under "RIGHTS OF MINORITIES."

Economic and Social Programme of the Congress (a)

- (i) The State shall protect indigenous cloth; and for this purpose pursue the policy of exclusion of foreign cloth and foreign yarn from the country and adopt such other measures as may be found necessary. The State shall also protect other indigenous industries when necessary against foreign competition.
- (ii) Intoxicating drinks and drugs shall be totally prohibited, except for medicinal purposes.
- (iii) Currency and exchange shall be regulated in the national interest.
- (iv) The State shall own or control key industries and services, mineral resources, railways, waterways, shipping and other means of public transport.
- (v) Relief of agricultural indebtedness and control of usury direct and indirect.
- (vi) The State shall provide for military training of citizens so as to organise a means of national defence apart from the regular military force.

(b) THE ALL-INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE

Founded in 1906.

CREED

1937—"The aims and objects of The All-India Muslim League shall be the establishment of full independence in the form of a federation of free democratic States in which the rights and interests of the Muslims and other minorities are adequately and effectively safeguarded in the constitution. (b)

1938—First Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference, Karachi, October 1938, presided over by Mr. M. A. Jinnah.

Resolution No. 5—Communal Settlement.

"Whereas the refusal on the part of the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress to negotiate a communal settlement with the All-India Muslim League, on the plea that the All-India Muslim League is not the sole representative body of the Mussalmans of India, indicates the Congress resolve to perpetually divide and rule the Muslim community, and thus once more mar the prospects of an amicable and peaceful solution of the Indian minorities problem, for which the League has tried in vain for more than 15 years.

Whereas the Congress has, by means of its powerful press and purse, launched a campaign of Muslim Mass Contact to cause disruption and division in the Muslim community with the object of deceiving the world into the belief that it is the sole representative organisation of entire India.

(a) WHITHER MINORITIES? by M. N. Dalal, page 110.

(b) THE INDIAN YEAR BOOK, 1941-42. (*Times of India Press*), page 229.

Whereas, it has deliberately established purely Hindu rule in certain provinces by forming ministries either without Muslim ministers or with Muslim ministers having no following among Muslim members, in direct and flagrant violation of the letter and spirit of the Government of India Act, 1935, and the Instrument of Instructions.

Whereas the ministries so formed have established a sort of rule which has for its aim the intimidation and demoralisation of Muslims, the extermination of the healthy and nation-building influences of Muslim culture, the suppression of Muslim religious customs and religious obligations and elimination of their political rights as a separate community.

Whereas it has in open defiance of the democratic principles persistently endeavoured to render the power of the Muslim majorities ineffective and impotent in the North-Western Province, Bengal, the Punjab and Sind by trying to bring into power or by supporting coalition ministries not enjoying the confidence of the majority of Muslim members and the Muslim masses of those provinces.

Whereas Congress has superimposed the authority of its High Command, a sort of fascist dictatorship, over the working of the Congress ministries to prevent the healthy growth of parliamentary conventions and establishment of constitutional traditions, to deprive the Muslims of their due share and have refused to reconstitute ministries in consonance with the constitution, having due regard to the rights and interests of Muslims.

Whereas the Congress has decided :-

- (a) to enforce Vidya Mandir Scheme in the teeth of Muslim opposition,
- (b) to foist the Bande-Matram on Muslims and others as a national anthem in callous disregard of the feelings of Muslims who consider the song as not only idolatrous but it is in origin and conception a hymn of hatred to Muslims,
- (c) to make Hindi with Devnagari script as the *Lingua Franca* of India in total defiance of the protests and wishes of the minorities with a view to inculcate Hindu religious ideas, philosophy and culture and establish dominance of Brahmanic culture in India,
- (d) to introduce and enforce joint electorates in local bodies with the strength of their majority and thus deprive Muslims of securing their true representation,
- (e) to close Urdu Schools wherever possible and discourage the teaching of the Urdu language, and thus ultimately wipe it off,
- (f) to suppress freedom of press and freedom of speech and legitimate action under the pretext of preventing incitement to violence and maintenance of law and order,
- (g) to interfere with the age-long religious privileges and usages of the Muslim community by force of arms and resort to repressive measures.

Whereas the majority community of India has fostered and maintained since thousands of years a rigid caste system of theirs which is a negative of nationalism, equality, democracy and all the noble ideals that the modern world aspires to and stands for and which system has further superimposed social and economic inequalities upon a vast body of the people of this country and reduced millions of them to the position of irredeemable helots. And whereas the evolution of a single united India and united Indian nation inspired by common aspirations and common ideals being impossible of realisation on account of the caste-ridden mentality and anti-Muslim policy of the majority community, and also on account of acute differences of religion, language, script, culture, social laws and outlook on life of the two major communities and even of race in certain parts. This Conference considers it absolutely essential in the interests of an abiding peace of the vast Indian continent and in the interests of unhampered cultural development, the economic and social betterment, and political self-determination of the two nations known as Hindus and Muslims, to recommend to All-India Muslim League to review and revise the entire question of what should be the suitable constitution for India which will secure honourable and legitimate status due to them, and that this Conference therefore recommends to the All India Muslim League to devise a scheme of Constitution under which Muslims may attain full independence.

Further this Conference records its emphatic disapproval of the Scheme of the All India Federation as embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, and is opposed to its introduction and urges upon the British Government to refrain from its enforcement as it considers the scheme to be detrimental to the interests of the people of India generally and those of the Muslims in particular.

That this Conference further declares that no constitution by whomsoever framed will be acceptable to the Muslims of India unless it conforms to the principle enunciated above and is prepared in consultation with and accepted by All India Muslim League." (a)

1940—Resolution No. 1 on future constitution of India passed at the 27th Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League held at Lahore on the 22nd/24th March, 1940. (Commonly known as the **"PAKISTAN RESOLUTION"**):—

"(1) While approving and endorsing the action taken by the Council and the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League as indicated in their resolutions dated the 27th of August, 17th and 18th of September and 22nd of October, 1939, and 3rd of February, 1940, on the constitutional issue, this Session of the All-India Muslim League emphatically reiterates that the scheme of federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, is totally unsuited to, and unworkable in the peculiar conditions of this country and is altogether unacceptable to Muslim India.

(2) It further records its emphatic view that while the declaration dated the 18th of October, 1939 made by the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty's Government is reassuring in so far as it

declares that the policy and plan on which the Government of India Act, 1935, is based will be reconsidered in consultation with the various parties, interests and communities in India, Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the whole constitutional plan is reconsidered *de novo* and that no revised plan would be acceptable to the Muslims unless it is framed with their approval and consent.

- (3) Resolved that it is the considered view of this Session of the All-India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principle, *viz.*, that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India should be grouped to constitute "Independent States" in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign.

That adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in these regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them; and in other parts of India where the Mussalmans are in a minority, adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them.

This Session further authorises the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles, providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary." (a)

1941—Clause (A) of the Article on the *CREED* in the League Constitution was amended to read as under:—

- (1) The establishment of completely independent States formed by demarcating geographically contiguous units into regions which shall be so constituted with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the north-western and eastern zones of India shall be grouped together to constitute independent States as Muslim free national homelands in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign:
- (2) That adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in the above mentioned units and regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them:

- (3) That in other parts of India where the Muslims are in a minority, adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specifically provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them. (a)

Constructive Programme

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League by a resolution passed on 22nd February, 1941 adopted the following **CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAMME** for the uplift of the Mussalmans economically, socially and educationally:—

- (i) that the cottage industries should be promoted and encouraged and stores should be established at central places on co-operative basis:
- (ii) that the Muslims should use Garha made by Mussalmans on all occasions of festivity and mourning, so that due impetus may be given to the Garha manufacture:
- (iii) that Night Schools should be opened in order to spread Adult Education:
- (iv) that un-Islamic ceremonies should be given up and discouraged:
- (v) that no loans on interest be taken for marriage and funeral ceremonies:
- (vi) that the use of Intoxicants and Gambling should be checked:
- (vii) that the true spirit of brotherhood, based on the Islamic conception of equality and fraternity should be infused among those Muslims who have adopted the un-Islamic view of caste based on profession and occupation:
- (viii) that Panchayats should be established, in order to settle ordinary disputes so that people may not suffer unnecessary monetary loss by going to law-courts:
- (ix) that Muslims should be persuaded to take to Commerce and Industries:
- (x) that full interest should be taken in all the schemes of rural uplift and progress. (b)

(c) THE ALL-INDIA HINDU MAHASABHA

1906 The Hindus of Bengal held a provincial conference where a resolution was passed viewing with apprehension 'the decrease in the normal growth of the Bengal Hindu population.'

A Provincial Hindu Sabha was founded in the Punjab with the object of 'watching and safeguarding the interests of the entire Hindu community in all respects.'

(a) THE INDIAN YEAR BOOK, 1941-42, (*Times of India Press*), page 922.

(b) INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1941, Vol. I, page 293.

- 1910 The All-India Hindu Mahasabha was founded at Allahabad.
- 1918 The Mahasabha session at Delhi demanded responsible self-government for India as a unit in the Empire.
- 1937 The Mahasabha declared as its goal the attainment of complete independence by all legitimate and peaceful means.
- 1939 As far as the future constitution of India is concerned, the Calcutta session of the Mahasabha resolved 'the All-India Hindu Mahasabha reaffirms complete independence as the goal of India's political aspirations and urges that a constitution based upon the Dominion Status as defined in the Statute of Westminster be immediately conferred on India.'
- 1940 At the Madura session in December the Mahasabha resolved *inter alia* that 'while reiterating faith in the goal of complete independence, the Mahasabha is prepared to accept Dominion Status of the Westminster type as the immediate step.'
- 1942 At the meeting of the All-India Committee of the Mahasabha held at Lucknow in March, the main political resolution declared *inter alia* that 'the only effective measure to counteract the defeatist shock and rouse the Indian people with proper spirit in this crisis is a bold and unambiguous proclamation on the part of the British Government that India is granted full independence and co-partnership equal with Great Britain in the Indo-British Commonwealth and such a declaration must be immediately made by the British Government.' (a)

Aims and Objects

"To organise and consolidate all sections of the Hindu Society into one organic whole; to protect and promote Hindu interests whenever and wherever necessary; to remove untouchability and generally ameliorate and improve the condition of the so called depressed-classes amongst the Hindus; to revive and promote the glorious ideals of Hindu womanhood; to promote cow-protection; to improve the physique of the Hindus and promote martial spirit amongst them by establishing military schools and organising volunteer corps; to reclaim all those who have left the Hindu fold; to found orphanages and rescue homes for orphans and homeless women; generally to take steps for promoting religious, educational, social, economic and political interests and rights of the Hindus; to promote good feelings between the Hindus and non-Hindu communities in Hindusthan and to act in a friendly way with them with a view to evolve a united and self-governing BHARATEEYA Nation based on equality of civic rights and duties irrespective of caste and creed.

Note:—The Mahasabha shall not side or identify or interfere with or oppose any particular sect or sects of the Hindu community in respect of its religious practices amongst themselves insofar as they do not infringe on the fundamental civic liberties of others. (b)

The Hindu Party

"It must be noted that the Hindu Mahasabha leaders do not expect that there would be a Mahasabha Party in the Legislatures. They expect that there

(a) THE INDIAN YEAR BOOK, 1942-43 (*The Times of India Press*), pages 826-8.

(b) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1941, Vol. I, page 276.

but a nationality. Hindutva does not depend on particular spiritual belief or system of philosophy. Before the advent of the Muslims and Christians all Hindu secular institutions, traditions, customs were 'Hindu' because they were Hindusthani or Indian. If a Sanatani Hindu becomes an Arya or a Brahmo, the Hindus do not feel the need of reconversion. A conversion from Hinduism to the Muslim or Christian faith is not dreaded because of the change of 'religious creed' involved in it, but because it removes the Hindutva which is a nationality.

Hindu Nationalism is in ultimate analysis only another name for true Indian nationalism.

"In a country like India where a religious unit tends inevitably to grow into a cultural and national unit, the Suddhi movement ceases to be merely a theological or dogmatic one, but assumes the wider significance of a political and national movement" (Savarkar in the introduction to 'History of the Hindu Mahasabha,' published by the Hindu Mahasabha Head Office, New Delhi, 1938).

In the secular and national sense of Hindutva all Christians and Mussalmans in this country should have been Hindu Christians and Hindu Mussalmans. A number of Christians have recently come forward to say that by religion they were Christians but by culture and nationality they were Hindus.

These religions came from outside India and brought with them non-Hindu (*i. e.* non-Indian) culture and customs, and proselytising in their case meant denationalising. Hindutva is the nationality in Hindusthan and of Hindusthan. The Hindu Mahasabha is not based on Hindu religion but on Hindu nationality and hence it is not a religious but a national organisation. (a)

CHAPTER II

POLITICAL GOAL FOR INDIA

Section (i) AS ENVISAGED BY BRITAIN

Queen Victoria's Proclamation, 1st November, 1858

".....We hereby announce to the native princes of India, that all treaties and engagements made with them by or under the authority of the East India Company are by us accepted, and will be scrupulously maintained, and we look for the like observance on their part.

We desire no extension of our present territorial possessions; and, while we will permit no aggression upon our dominions or our rights to be attempted with impunity, we shall sanction no encroachment on those of others.

We shall respect the rights, dignity, and honour of native princes as our own; and we desire that they, as well as our own subjects, should enjoy that prosperity and that social advancement which can only be secured by internal peace and good government.

We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we faithfully and conscientiously fill.

Firmly relying ourselves on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of religion, we disclaim alike the right and the desire to impose our convictions on any of our subjects. We declare it to be our royal will and pleasure that none be in any wise favoured, none molested or disquieted, by reason of their religious faith or observances, but that all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the law; and we do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under us that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of our subjects on pain of our highest displeasure.

And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to office in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity duly to discharge.....

When, by the blessing of Providence, internal tranquillity shall be restored, it is our desire to stimulate the peaceful industry of India, to promote works of public utility and improvement, and to administer the government for the benefit of all our subjects resident therein. In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all power grant to us, and to those in authority under us, strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people." (a)

Declarations of 1917 and 1929.

"The goal of British policy was stated, in the declaration of August, 1917, to be that of providing for the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. As I recently pointed out, my own Instrument of Instructions from the King-Emperor, expressly states that it is His Majesty's will and pleasure, that the plans laid by Parliament in 1919 should be the means by which British India may attain its due place among His Dominions. Ministers of the Crown, moreover, have, more than once, publicly declared that it is the desire of the British Government that India should, in the fullness of time, take her place in the Empire in equal partnership with the Dominions. But in view of the doubts which have been expressed, both in Great Britain and India, regarding the interpretation to be placed on the intentions of the British Government, in enacting the Statute of 1919, I am authorised on behalf of His Majesty's Government to state clearly, that in their judgment, it is implicit in the declaration of 1917, that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress, as there contemplated, is the attainment of Dominion Status" (Lord Irwin, 31st October, 1929).*

Before the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Indian Reforms

LORD IRWIN—"My much discussed (above) declaration dealt with the realm of ultimate purpose. It made no commitments whatever as to date."

Mr. CHURCHILL—"Dominion Status is a distant, remote goal which it is not practicable to take into consideration in any period which human beings need take account of."

Lord Irwin in America in 1932—"We are trying within the Empire to foster the creation of a United India, sufficiently at one within herself in respect of those fundamentals on which every nation-State must rest, that we may devolve upon her people the power for the control of their own affairs, and the ordering of their own political life. And if the issue of what we seek to do is to reflect our aim truly and endure, this unity, at once the condition and criterion of success, must evoke not only the respect but the loyalty of an India, content and proud to realise its full destiny, through imperial partnership."

† Lord Irwin, Lecture at Toronto University, 1932.

Amery on India's Political Goal

"The Viceroy's immediate offer does not, however, stand by itself. His initiative has been concerned, as I said just now, not only with India's fuller participation in the actual present war effort, but also with paving the way towards a speedier attainment of the goal at which we are aiming."

* "WHITHER MINORITIES?" by M. N. DALAL, pages 98-99.

† RISE AND FULFILMENT OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA, by Edward Thompson and G. T. Garratt, page 597.

May I say a word about that goal, Dominion Status, as it has commonly been described, or as I prefer to describe it, a free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth. It is not, as is so often implied when Dominion Status is contrasted with full independence, an inferior or dependent status. The status in the Commonwealth of the Dominions—or of this country for that matter, for our status is the same though not perhaps our stature—is indeed superior to that of nations that perforce stand alone.

How many so-called independent nations are really free to live their own lives as they will, even when they are not directly overrun or dismembered by more powerful neighbours? We of the British Commonwealth enjoy something more. We enjoy the security, the prosperity, the friendship and, I would add, the enhanced dignity in the eyes of the world which come to each of us as a result of our free and equal association.

There is no higher status in the world than that, and that is the status which we have declared to be the goal of our policy in India." (a)

Extract from "50 Facts about India." (b)

1. "India has been offered full self-government after the war. No reservation was made by the British Government as to India remaining a member of the British Commonwealth.
2. Acceptance and Implementation of any constitution framed immediately after the cessation of hostilities by an elected body of Indians was undertaken by the British Government in March, 1942. If any Province should not agree to the proposed constitution, that need not impede Indian Independence, as Britain is ready to recognise that province's independence separately.
3. To develop Self-Government in India through the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions, has been the British policy since 1917. In 1929, the British Government stated that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress was the attainment of Dominion Status—a free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth of Nations."

The Charter that did not apply to India

—The Atlantic Charter (14-8-1941)

The Charter defined certain common principles in the national policies of the United States of America and Britain on which they based their hopes for a better future of the world. Its eight points ran as follows:

"First, their countries seek no aggrandisement—territorial or other.

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely-expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

(a). "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION," pages 148-9.

(b) THE DAILY GAZETTE, KARACHI, 2nd February, 1943.

- Fourth, they will endeavour, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.
- Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security.
- Sixth, after the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.
- Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.
- Eighth, they believe that all nations of world for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten or may threaten aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments." (a)

In a speech in the House of Commons on 9th September, 1941, Mr. Churchill said :—

"The Joint Declaration (the Atlantic Charter) does not qualify in any way the various statements of policy which have been made from time to time about development of constitutional government in India, Burma, or other parts of the British Empire. We have pledged by the Declaration of August, 1940 to help India to obtain free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth of Races subject, of course, to the fulfilment of obligations arising from our long connection with India and our responsibilities to its many creeds, races and interests. Burma also is covered by our considered policy of establishing Burma's self-government by measures already in progress." (b)

Section (ii) AS ENVISAGED BY INDIANS

By The Congress—1907—"Self-Government," or 'SWARAJ,' like that of the United Kingdom or the Colonies—

(*'Dadabhoj Naoroji: The Grand Old Man of India,'* by R. P. Masani, page 500).

1929—The attainment of PURNA SWARAJ (COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE) by all legitimate and peaceful means (page 5 ante).

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1941, Vol. II, page 82.

(b) " " " " " " II, " 84.

By The All-India Muslim League { —PAKISTAN, i.e., the establishment of *Complete Independent Muslim States* in areas where the Muslim are in a majority. (page 10 ante).*

By The All-India Hindu Mahasabha { —The attainment of **FULL INDEPENDENCE** and Co-Partnership equal with Great Britain in the Indo-British Commonwealth (page 13 ante).

The All-India Depressed Classes Conference { —The Pakistan, The Azad Punjab, and other separatist schemes were condemned in a resolution adopted by the All-India Depressed Classes Conference held at Amritsar on 12th April, 1943, Mr. H. J. Khandekar presiding.

The Conference demanded **COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE** for India and described as 'absolutely baseless' the official statement that the Depressed Classes were opposed to the demand for the independence of the country. * *

The Goal of "The Oppressed and Exploited Masses"

Extract from the Proceedings of the All-India Trade Union Congress, at their session held at Calcutta on the 21st April, 1935 under the Presidentship of Mr. Hariharnath Sastri:—

"By adopting a lengthy resolution, the Congress declared that the exploitation in India had resulted in the poverty of the Indian masses and called upon the working class of India to actively participate in the struggle for national freedom.

While making this declaration, the Congress was fully convinced that national freedom, opening before the Indian masses the road to progress and prosperity, could not be attained as a gift from the foreign imperialist rulers of the country.

The resolution further added: "Neither the newly proposed reforms nor much-coveted Dominion Status will, in any way, free the Indian working class and any other oppressed exploited classes from the continued economic exploitation and political bondage. Therefore, this Congress emphatically condemns the India Bill as an attack on the movement for national liberation. This Congress is of opinion that the capture of political power by the oppressed masses is the essential condition for real national freedom.

The Congress further declares that any constitution, worked out by the spokesmen of the British Raj and their allies in India, will not be acceptable to the Indian people. This Congress maintains that none but the Indian people have the right to frame the future constitution of free India and the fundamental laws of free National State can only be formulated through the National Constituent Assembly, the only democratic organ of power of the Indian oppressed masses.

*In Mr. Jinnah's words "the goal of the All-India Muslim League is that we want to establish a completely independent State in the northwest and eastern zones of India with full control finally on defence, foreign affairs, communications, customs, currency, exchange, etc. We do not want under any circumstances a constitution of an All-India character with one Government at the centre." *THE INDIAN YEAR BOOK, 1941-42, The Times of India Press, page 920.*

**The Daily Gazette, Karachi, 13th April, 1943.

This Congress reiterates the following basic principle of the constitution of Free India as formulated by the Cawnpore Session of the All-India Trade Union Congress:

- (1) Transfer of all power to the oppressed and exploited masses.
- (2) Abolition of Native States and parasitic landlordism.
- (3) Freedom of peasantry from all exploitation and exaction so that the greater part of their surplus production remains in their hand.
- (4) Nationalisation of land, public utilities, mineral resources, banks, and all other key industries in the country.
- (5) Unconditional repudiation of all debts contracted by foreign government.
- (6) Improvement of the condition of the industrial workers through the introduction of minimum wages, limited hours of work, insurance against unemployment, old age, sickness, maternity and social legislation for the general protection of labour.
- (7) Control of the economic life of the country by the oppressed masses to guarantee that fruits of national freedom will not be usurped by the fortunate few.
- (8) Abolition of indirect taxation and introduction of free compulsory primary education.
- (9) Freedom of press, speech, association, expression and assembly.
- (10) Abolition of all other charges on the peasantry except unitary tax. And many other demands." (a)

PART-II—TODAY

CHAPTER

CURRENT HISTORY

Mr. Amery on the Indian Constitutional Deadlock. (a)

Extract from a speech delivered at the Overseas League, London, on the 25th September, 1940:—

“Regret that the leaders of the Indian National Congress had rejected the Viceroy’s offer was expressed by Mr. L. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India, in a speech at the Overseas League, London, on the 25th September, 1940.

Mr. Amery after references to India’s magnificent war effort asked: What of the moral and spiritual side? Where does India stand in the struggle against the forces of tyranny and oppression? Where are her sympathies enlisted, with which side are her interests identified? On this point there certainly is no divergence among the leaders of Indian opinion whatever other differences there may be between them. They know that the defeat of the British Empire and the victory of the dictatorships would leave India defenceless against inevitable aggression from every quarter by land, sea or by air. They know more. They know that it would mean the end of all their cherished hopes of constitutional progress within India and in India’s relation to the outside world.

Whatever the domestic political difficulties that confront us in this period of transition in India, it is a bond of union between Indians and ourselves, and for us a source of legitimate pride, that the ideals of freedom, which animate them have had their fountainhead here. Their political traditions and aspirations like those of the Dominions, on, for that matter, like those of the United States, go back to the *Magna Carta* and to the whole-age-long growth of social justice and constitutional liberty in this little Island. For them, as for us, a Nazi victory would be a deathblow to all they care for in world politics. But India’s choice in this matter goes even deeper than the domain of political ideals. It goes to the very heart of all that she values in the spiritual field.

It has become commonplace to point out that the Nazi Creed with its denial of any rights to the individual against the State or the party or gang in control of the State, with its denial of any rights to any nation or race outside the chosen German people, with its contempt for justice and for intellectual truth is a barbarian revolt against all influences ancient and modern which have created our western Christian Civilization. But it is more than that. It is a direct attack upon the spiritual basis of all religions. It is as profoundly opposed to Islam with its insistence on equality of all men before God and on the supreme virtues of justice and mercy or to Hinduism with its deep seated hatred of violence and cruelty as it is to Christianity. The Nazi onslaught threatens the soul of Indians, it threatens ours and there is no Indian who does not realise that menace.

Linked with the consciousness of this underlying identity of material and moral interests there is more directly personal sympathy for this country, in its hour of danger and admiration for our single-handed stand which has found expression even in quarters where political criticism of the present Government of India is most vocal. Whatever else the Indian press may say about public affairs, it has never failed to pay its tribute to our fighting forces or those who in civil life here are bearing the brunt of the war. The greater our difficulties and anxieties here the more keenly have the people of India given expression to their sympathy.....

How comes it then, you may well ask, that we hear so much of political crisis and political deadlock in India? Why is it that the leaders of Indian political parties have not been able to sink their differences with each other or with the Indian Government in order to help whole-heartedly in their country's war, or why has Government for its part failed to meet India's aspiration by concessions which might secure the united co-operation of all parties and elements in India's national life?

The answer to these questions could be easier if there were any common platform upon which these elements could agree either with regard to the immediate present or the future. It would be easier if India were a homogeneous country in which the majority could fairly be entitled to speak for the whole nation and carry with it the assent, even if reluctant, of the minority. It would, in fact, be easy enough if nature and history had not made the Indian national life and the Indian Government complex structures which they actually are.

One attempt to deal with the complex problem of Indian self-government was made in the Government of India Act passed five years ago. The fruit of years of enquiry and discussion to which the best brains in India had made no small contribution, it represented a genuine constructive effort on the part of Parliament to balance the claims of different elements within India itself as well as to find during the period of transition a workable compromise between the responsibilities which the British Government had inherited from the past and the responsibilities which India was destined to shoulder in the future.

In its provincial aspects it has worked successfully in four out of eleven provinces which have not been affected by the calling (out) of the Congress party ministries.

If it had been found impossible to apply it in its Federal aspect to India as a whole, it is not because there is general agreement among Indians that its provisions retain too much British control but because there is vehement disagreement between Indians themselves as to the general control which it gives to Indians over each other. The Congress party objects, on grounds of egalitarian democracy, to the influence which the Act concedes to the autocratically governed states. The states on their side have shrunk from the extent of interference in their affairs conceded to the elected majority in the Central Legislature. The great Moslem community refuses to entrust its fate to the control of permanent Hindu majority.

These are none of them trivial or factitious objections. They are all sincerely held and deeply felt. Each of these major elements in India's national life—the Congress, the Muslims, the Princes, not to speak of the representatives of elements and parties within the Hindu community but opposed to the Congress—has a case of righteousness of which it is

convinced. Nothing is more remote from truth than the suggestion that the British Government has deliberately magnified or even encouraged these differences as an excuse for delaying constitutional progress. On the contrary it is precisely the prospect of constitutional progress that has intensified these differences by raising a question which lay dormant under autocratic control.

On the other hand it would be equally wrong if the British Government ignored them and forgetting the responsibilities which the course of history has imposed upon it in India, light-heartedly accepted some constitutional solution which would inevitably be rejected by large and important elements in India's national life and only lead to confusion and chaos.

The fact is that India's internal structure is complex and difficult and no plausible formula but only patience and genuine willingness to compromise can find a solution. The differences are real but I refuse to regard them as unbridgeable. Fortunately there is a real underlying agreement as to the goal at which we are all aiming. We all wish to see India freely conducting her own affairs at peace within herself and with the world outside. I believe the agreed goal can best be achieved within, the free and equal partnership of the British Commonwealth. There are some in India who would wish to see that partnership dissolved, at least in theory, for none of them would be willing to dispense with it in practice in our day or are prepared to suggest a better alternative. In any case the ground for agreed advance is there.

It is in the light of that situation that His Majesty's Government has made it clear in the statement issued by the Viceroy on August, 8th that subject to fulfilment of the obligations which Great Britain's long connection with India has imposed on her, it is our wish to see the framework of India's future constitution devised by Indians for themselves in accordance with Indian conceptions of social, economic and political structure of Indian life and through the instrumentality of a body representative of the principal elements in India's national life.

The Act of 1935 was still in essentials the work of the British Government and Parliament and was based on the existing structure of Indian Government and inspired by British ideas. The main permanent framework of the future constitution of India as a Dominion is now, "a matter for the Indians to settle for themselves. The whole constitutional field, the relations of the various parts and elements in India to the whole, the methods of election and representation, all these matters are open to re-examination. Only, as in the case of every Dominion or for that matter any federation in the past, there must be that measure of agreement: of consent—and necessarily, therefore, of compromise—between the main constituent elements that have in the future to live and work together, which is a preliminary condition of free self-government.

In this matter the British Government have now made clear one essential of the implications of India's future status while imposing upon Indians one of the first responsibilities of that status. It is obvious that a change so far-reaching both in structure and in the very basis of authority of India's Government, cannot take place at a moment when the whole of the Commonwealth is in the throes of a struggle for its existence. But that need not of itself involve any delay. If the actual body which is decisively to resolve these issues cannot meet until immediately after the war, there is bound to be immense amount of preliminary investigation, discussion and

negotiation which must precede any agreed conclusion and which is bound to take time. There is no reason why this work should wait for the end of the war.

So much for the present situation. As for the future, it is for the Indians themselves to consider how and by what new expedient or by what compromises they can arrive at a solution of their own problems. They can count, at every stage, upon the willing co-operation of the Government to help in expediting progress.

Meanwhile, I do not believe that Indian differences in the political field will be allowed to obscure the genuine desire of India as a whole to make her worthy contribution to the victory of a cause which is India's cause as much as it is our own. And I sincerely hope, to quote the closing words of Lord Linlithgow's recent statement, 'that in this process new bonds of union and understanding will emerge and thus pave the way towards the attainment by India of that free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth which remains the proclaimed and accepted goal of the Imperial Crown and the British Parliament.'

Mr. Amery on 'India First'. (a)

Mr. L. S. Amery applied the slogan 'INDIA FIRST' when speaking at a luncheon in London on the 12th December, 1940 he said:

"It is of the essence of politics in our democratic age that it is largely governed by slogans, by simple words or phrases, which sum up a principle, a method or purpose which can be applied to almost every situation and which gain strength by constant reiteration. Is there such a slogan or watchword which can effectively be applied to the affairs of India in this present difficult juncture and applied not only by Indians of every community or section in their relations to each other or to the British Government, but also by Englishmen whether here or in India in their outlook upon the Indian problem and afford equally helpful guidance to all of us?

I believe that there is, and I am going to be bold enough to submit it for your consideration here and not for your consideration only, but also, if my words and their sincere purpose carry that far, to Indians in their own country. That watchword is 'INDIA FIRST.' Let me say to begin with what I mean by the word 'India.' By India, I mean India as a whole, India as nature and history have shaped her: India with her infinite diversity and underlying unity: India as she is today and as we wish her to be in the years to come. India like our own island was subjected to many influences from without. Wave after wave of invaders has swept down upon her through her north-western gateway, no doubt, even before the days of the fair-skinned northern pastoralists who gave to most of India her Aryan speech and her most characteristic religious philosophy. For a thousand years, Islam penetrated and permeated India not only as a conquering but as a proselytising force.

None of these influences found any natural barrier to arrest them. They remained strongest, no doubt, in the regions they first entered but in varying degrees they spread in every direction to India's furthest confines. Hinduism and Islam in very varying proportions are co-terminous over the whole sub-continent. What is more, in the process, history has created in

India, in spite of infinite variations in detail, variations everywhere shading insensibly into each other her own distinctive human type and in a large measure her own distinctive way of life. The last but in some respects the most potent of all these external influences has been that of this country exercised upon India, now for nearly 300 years. Its effect upon India's racial composition and internal social structure has been negligible. But in the political domain, the effect has far exceeded that of any of its predecessors. Every previous rule in India had inevitably attempted to extend its authority over India as a whole.

The British rule alone succeeded in giving India that political unity which is the indispensable condition of her free and peaceful development. It gave to India what the Norman conquest gave England—a strong ordered administration. It gave what England won for herself in the *Magna Carta*, the reign of law and a legal system which Indian judges and lawyers have progressively contributed to administer and to enrich. It gave above all in the English language not only a common medium but a common foundation of political thinking among Indians of every class or creed. In that sense at least the British influence in India has become an integral part of her national life and India and England are today in political outlook and aspiration, if not in race, members of one political family. What I want to emphasise is that in these things the political unity of India and the development in India of British conceptions of individual freedom and national self-government are intimately connected.

The internal unity and peace enforced by the strong hand of our early Norman kings and the external security afforded by our insular position were in no small measure responsible for the growth of freedom in this country, just as the absence of clearly defined frontiers, racial or geographical, has fostered autocracy and militarism in central Europe.

Once broken up into separate and independent entities, India would relapse as it did in the decline of the Mogul empire into a welter of contending powers in which free institutions would inevitably be suppressed and in which no one element would have the resources with which to defend itself against external attack, whether by land or by sea.

I have tried to explain what I mean by India. What then do I mean by 'INDIA FIRST?' I think that I can best convey my meaning in alternative ways, putting myself in the place first of one and then of another of those to whom I wish to commend this watchword. Let me begin by placing myself in the position of a British Indian, a member of the Hindu community, a believer in Indian freedom from outside control and in democracy—shall I say a follower of the Congress or of the Hindu Mahasabha? What should 'INDIA FIRST' mean for one in that position? How in that case should I interpret it for myself? Would it not be in some such sense as follows? 'If I put India first, then must I not win over to my conception of India's future my Moslem neighbour who is as essentially and necessarily a part of India as I am? I may prefer a democratic system on the simple majority basis that prevails in England and a closely knit centralised constitution. But should those preferences stand in the way of some compromise which would enable him to feel that his community will as surely enjoy in the future India as real a freedom and as full a development of its individual, communal and cultural entity as my own? I may dislike autocracy. But should I therefore exclude from Indian unity, Indian autonomy, States which are an indispensable part of that unity and which in their way of life and traditions are the most characteristically

Indian parts of India; rather than welcome them and trust to time and example to bring about the changes which I might desire?"

On the other hand, if I put myself in the shoes of an Indian Moslem, how should I then interpret 'INDIA FIRST?' Would it not be in some such wise? 'Bound as I am to assert the right of my own community to be recognized as a permanent element in India's national life and not as mere numerical minority, am I entitled to put that claim to the point of imposing a veto on all political progress except at the cost of a complete break up of Indian unity, which would be equally disastrous to us both?'

What again would be the meaning of 'INDIA FIRST' to the ruler of an Indian State? Would it not be something to this effect: 'Much as I prize the privileged and secure position assured to me by my treaty with the Imperial Crown, sincerely as I believe that my long-established methods of Government make for the welfare of my people, have I not a special obligation as a natural leader in India to make my contribution in Indian unity by the sacrifice of some of my sovereign powers and by such reforms in the internal constitution of my own state as will bring it more nearly in harmony with the political life of India as a whole?'

From every element in India the watchword 'INDIA FIRST' demands comprehensive tolerance and compromise; acceptance of the real India as it exists today, not the uncompromising insistence upon the immediate and complete realisation of the theoretical India which any particular element or party has inscribed upon its banner.

So far I have spoken of the issue as affecting the relations between the different elements within India itself. What of the relation between India and Britain? What should 'INDIA FIRST' mean either to an Indian in relation to the British Commonwealth or to an Englishman in his relation to the affairs of India? Should it for an Indian mean partnership in that Commonwealth or severance from it? Let me answer that question by first putting another. What would 'Britain First' mean to me as an Englishman?

My own immediate duty is to my own country to do what I can to make Britain prosperous, secure, honoured among the nations and exercising her influence for freedom, peace and progress in the world. At the same time, I know that nothing can contribute more to every one of these objects than the continuance and development of that free co-operation with nations essentially kindred in outlook and ideals which is the foundation of our British Commonwealth.

The maintenance of that Commonwealth means for us the enlargement as severance would spell the diminution of our freedom. Is it otherwise with India? Is that security which 'INDIA FIRST' implies ever possible for India except in assured reliance upon some wider partnership? And where could India find a partnership more effective in its support, less exacting in its demands and above all more concordant in its character with India's innate spiritual outlook as well as with the political outlook which the centuries of British influence have implanted in her leaders? Nor is there any conflict between the claims upon my conduct or that of any other Englishman in his relation to Indian affairs, of 'BRITAIN FIRST' and of 'INDIA FIRST.' Believing as I do that the highest interest of Britain lies in the strength and permanence of the British Commonwealth I know that the strength of that Commonwealth and the permanence of that Commonwealth can only be based on the fullest freedom, the fullest development, the fullest variety of individual life in each of its parts.

I think I can claim in all sincerity that it was from that point of view that the Viceroy made a memorable statement three months ago. That statement outlined the procedure by which Indians can arrive at the agreed framework of India's future constitution. It offered to Indian political leaders as an immediate instalment as wide and effective participation in the government of India as is practicable under the conditions of the present struggle for existence and with the basis for an agreed constitution still wholly unsettled. That offer has for the moment been rejected, not because it was in itself inadequate but because the spirit of 'INDIA FIRST,' the spirit of agreement, of compromise, of a recognition of realities, was not strong enough to overcome the insistence of unpractical demands on one side or undue suspicion on the other. I am not prepared to believe that this will be India's final reaction to the offer which is still before her.

There must be many of every party and every community in India, younger men with ideals and yet wide-eyed for reality, men of ability prepared to grapple with the sheer intellectual difficulties of the problem, practical men of affairs accustomed to give and take, who between them, by patient study and frank discussion, should be able to find a way out of a deadlock between contending Indian claims which cannot serve, either India or that common cause in the present conflict which every Indian knows is as much his own as it is ours. It is to them above all that I would commend the watchword of 'INDIA FIRST' which I have made my theme to you here today."

Mr. Amery on the need for wider unity

Extract from a speech in the Commons on the 22nd April, 1941—(a)

"Above all, we welcome every effort that Indians can make to come together and find a solution to India's complex and difficult problem, which will do justice alike to the claims of her diverse elements for the due recognition of their individuality and to the need of that wider unity, which is essential to her peace and prosperity. I have dwelt deliberately upon Indian responsibility in the matter, for unless Indians are prepared to face that responsibility now, they will fail to face it hereafter. Any agreement imposed by us from without cannot survive the withdrawal of our power to enforce it. Only a real agreement, freely reached, can stand that test. It is for Indian statesmen to find that measure of agreement which is indispensable, if we on our side are to make our further contribution towards the completion of our own task in India, the task of joining with them in crowning the peace and unity already achieved with freedom."

..... We must not forget how deep are the inherent division in India, and how relatively remote even now war seems to many in India, above all among those whose whole career has been in political agitation and trouble and to whom political interest still seems the dominant one. We have to enable India to get out of that attitude, to get rid of the cocoon of old controversies into which elder Indian politicians spin themselves.....(b).

Mahatma Gandhi's Rejoinder—"Withdraw and we shall unite!"

"I admit that there is unfortunately an unbridgeable gulf between the Congress and the Muslim League. Why do not British Statesmen admit

that it is after all a domestic quarrel? Let them withdraw from India and I promise that the Congress and the League and all other parties will find it to their interest to come together and devise a home-made solution for the Government of India. It may not be scientific; it may not be after any western pattern; but it will be durable.....(a).

Mr. Amery Again

"There is no essential difficulty so far as this country's intentions are concerned in India setting on the way to Dominion Status. The difficulty lies not so much in the devolution of authority as in making sure that there is an authority in India which can take over and will not break down or break up in the process. The difficulty does remain and it is no use pretending that it does not in India itself, in those divisions in India which have shown themselves with increasing acuteness as the prospect of free government comes nearer." (b)

The proverbial 'Vicious Circle' is complete! Says one, 'Combine and we shall transfer power.' Says the other, 'Transfer power and we shall combine!'

Mr. Amery on 'The Major Issue'

Extract from a speech in the Commons dated the 1st August, 1941—(c)

"Today, the major issue is not whether India should govern herself but how is she to govern herself; under what type of constitution it is possible to preserve her unity and yet secure freedom and reasonable self-expression for the varied elements which compose her national life.....

The course of events since then and the experience of the actual working of responsible government in the provinces have raised most formidable queries as to the possibility of that system in India, at any rate so far as the Central Government is concerned. We must remember that our system of government here, which we rightly prize as the most flexible and efficient form of democratic government in the world—a system which seems to us so natural and easily workable—does depend entirely for its working upon certain indispensable conditions. It postulates a party system in which loyalty to party is never the supreme loyalty but is always in the last resort subordinate to a sense of loyalty to national interest as a whole and responsibility for the successful working of parliament as an institution. That system of ours is based on majority decisions because it assumes that the majority in every case is the result of free discussion and that minority of today will very probably be the majority of tomorrow. These conditions do not exist where party loyalty and party discipline override all other considerations, where party executives outside the parliament are the only arbiters of policy and real rulers, where the minority always remains the under-dog. There our system ceases to be workable and other methods have to be devised to preserve freedom and democracy.

In India experience of party government in the provinces has rightly or wrongly convinced great and powerful elements in Indian national life that their lives and their liberties would not be assured under the central provisions of the present Act or under any amendment of it which would

(a) INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER 1941, Vol. I, page 327.

(b) " " " " " I, 324.

(c) " " " " " II, Pages 06-07.

still leave the executive control of all India in the hands of a Government, dependent upon a parliamentary majority from day to day which, in its turn, obeys unswervingly the dictates of an outside executive. This reaction against the dangers of what is called the Congress Raj or the Hindu Raj has gone so far as to lead to a growing demand from Moslem quarters for a complete breaking up of India into separate Hindu and Moslem dominions. I need say nothing today of manifold, and to my mind, insuperable objections to such a scheme, at any rate in its extreme form. I would only note that it merely shifts the problem of permanent minorities to somewhat smaller areas without solving it. It is a counsel of despair and, I believe, wholly unnecessary despair, for, I do not doubt that there is enough constructive ability and enough natural goodwill among the Hindus and Moslems and enough Indian patriotism to find a constitutional solution which will give fair recognition to all communities and all interests...."

The Dream of a Muslim India

"The dream of recovering the reigns of authority in the State in India which has slipped from Muslim hands is in the consciousness of many Muslims, modern-educated Muslims, realities of today, within the grasp of resolute men. It would be foolish for Indian public men and publicists to shut their eyes to the sinister possibilities of the schemes of federations outlined by Muslim thinkers and public men. These have revived ambitions, provoked particularistic conceits, and stimulated aggressive activities that would result in breaking up the unity and integrity that have been India's from beyond recorded time. Reformers and reactionaries among the leaders of the Muslim community in India appear to be helpless instruments in the hands of forces that are almost elemental in their sweep and violence. These ambitions and activities have called forth answering ambitions and activities in the Hindu community represented by the Hindu Mahasabha Movement.

There appears to be no possibility of reconciling these ambitions. The Indian National Congress which has been trying to stand between these, absorbing the force of their clash, trying to act as a mediator, has so far failed in its attempts. And the scene is darkened by clouds of communal bitterness, of misunderstanding, which show no signs of dispersing. Men of goodwill both among Hindus and Muslims appear to be getting sick of these bickerings, to be retiring from the leadership of their communities and leaving the field to ambitious people who have forgotten that in the modern world the cement of social life is not supplied by religious beliefs and practices, that in countries where men and women professing different religions have been living for centuries, they cannot afford to be over-punctilious with regard to the observance of their particular ceremonials, that fanaticism in respect of them is not only a crime, it is a sin against the spirit of all religious life. We can only live in the hope that this is a passing phase, that the awakening that characterises the life of the communities will be diverted to activities that will serve the common interests of all. But today, as Sri Chakravarti Rajagopalachari, Premier of Madras, said, 'no man could speak on these subjects without feeling a sense of despair and sadness.' Withal we are upheld by the hope and aspiration given expression to by the same Congress leader on the occasion of the celebration of the birth and death of the Prophet of Islam organised by a Muslim association of Madras on May 21, 1939:

'People of India were often told that they had many religions, many languages, and many customs, and were therefore an unfortunate

people on the whole. But it might not be so in truth. It might be that there was a great ambition also to be achieved, and that in the midst of all the variety, they might see the universal truth and the beauty of life. That, if attained, would be a great thing. A very highly civilised people realising the unity of all religions was a great ambition which they had still before them and for which they should work hard and with pleasure. All the troubles might perhaps be leading towards the fulfilment of a great and unique glory in their own country.'

Prophets and saints in India have been through the centuries and millenniums of her history trying to build up a composite life out of the varieties of religious experiences and the intuitions of the spiritual realm assembled in India from all quarters of the globe. The perception and realisation of the unity that pervades creation has been one of the gifts of Hindu culture to the storehouse of world wisdom and spirituality. And the ambition referred to by the Madras Premier might not be as far-fetched as it appears today when India is being rocked on the stresses and strains of communal and sectarian suspicions, fears and ambitions. (a)

Oracles—Old and New (b)

"The controversies and conflicts in India that divide the classes and masses—what do they represent as a part of the process that has been remaking a new India? They represent a great dissatisfaction in the heart of a society that appears to have stood immobile through the centuries, that looked to Manu and Mahommed, to their days and to the philosophies built up by them in response to the search for a new valuation of human thought and human practice needed by the necessities of their particular days. It is asserted that the modern times have created new necessities that required new methods and new social habits to meet them, that the ideologies indicated in the Manu Smriti or the *Manava Dharma*—the religion of humanity—preached in it and that embodied in the Quran, are inadequate for modern purposes, for the mind and the body of the modern men and women. To the wide-awake among the classes, to the products of the modern universities established in India, the old concepts and ideologies and practices make no appeal; they feel that no self-respecting individual life, no well-balanced social life, could be built upon them—life that was free from exploitation, conscious and unconscious. . . . One can feel that these controversies grow out of the break-down in social life as it affects the educated, the modern-educated classes of India. The ancient oracles of their own country have no message for them: the oracles from outside their country speak in so many voices that they are not sure which one should they hearken to and follow. Gandhiji has for the last twenty years been holding up ideal of conduct that the educated classes find difficult to accept without mental reservations. Younger men such as Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru and Sri Subhas Chandra Bose seek and find inspiration in Socialism or Communism, or variants of these; the latter hopes that under the Indian sky 'a synthesis of Communism and Fascism' may be a part of the 'next phase in world history.' The masses in India cannot be said to be conscious of the total bankruptcy of their social values. Under the guidance of men like Swami Sahajananda Saraswati they may be dreaming of KISAN RAJ; under the guidance of communalist leaders, Hindu and Muslim, there is danger of their ranging themselves under the

ochre coloured Swastika flag of militant Hinduism and under the green-coloured Crescent flag of militant Islam. The appeal of Indian Nationalism is being diverted to other channels; the appeal to the 'Economic Man' may not reach the consciousness of men and women whom non-economic concepts have moulded. These are the impersonal forces that have been forging ahead to re-make India. No student of Indian history as it is evolving before his eyes, can remain unaffected by them, or be unconscious of their growing strength, of their threat to the unity and integrity of the country. He cannot watch these without being moved by fears and hopes, depressed more by the former than held up by the latter." (a)

The British Government

"By every declaration made by the Secretary of State or by the Governor-General of India since the representatives of the Indian National Congress put to them the question of India's place in the present war, they have placed in the hands of each of the minority 'elements' in India a right of veto over the emergence of any satisfactory and self-respecting solution of the Indian problem. Every statement of theirs has encouraged the minorities to put up their claims till today nothing appears to remain of India as a political unit but a hotch-potch of disintegrated conceits. Thus has the impasse been created because 'too scrupulous to coerce a minority,' Britain has been 'coercing a majority without a sign of hesitation.' So far as one can say and see, there appears to be no way out of the difficulty for Britain but to pursue her policy in silence, and for India to watch in silence the fight for 'New Orders' that will be emerging out of the fire and smoke of the present war as during the last World War, twenty-five years back, when the world had been led to believe that the end of all wars was in sight and the rule of the 'self-determination of nations' would prevail over the world. This hope may uphold the belligerent peoples during the excitement of the times. Perhaps it is best so. For such a hope can never be fulfilled as long as bloodshed is accepted as the test of truth and justice in international differences." (b)

How a Turkish Journalist looks at it

"The Government of India Act, 1935, gave Indians the right to enter legislative bodies in all the autonomous provinces through elections, and to become prime ministers and members of Government. With the Cripps proposals of 1942 another possibility was added—they were given the right to have a completely Independent Government at the end of this war. The British gave up even the idea of pressing for the establishment of federated states in India, and decided to accept any decision to be taken by the Indians themselves, even though such a decision might imply complete separation of India from the British Empire.

It may be argued that the British made this proposal because they knew that such a solution was impracticable, but it cannot be said that the differences which render such an understanding impossible are British inventions or a British creation.

.....In all these circumstances, one wonders why misunderstanding exists between the Indian nationalists and the British. The difference is due to the fact according to the Westerners who survey Indian questions only a system of federation can be given to India which, as in the case of Australia,

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1939, Vol. I, pages 77-78.

(b) " " " " 1941 " " " 120.

South Africa and Canada; will turn the country into a dominion in the long run. The Governments of Indian States agree to this, and many Muslim and Hindu intellectuals are of the same opinion. But neither the Congress Party nor the Muslim League wants a federation. The Congress wants a single Indian State, the Muslims their independence in Pakistan first.

Is a single and whole Indian State possible? Only the nationalists of the Congress Party are of this conviction. Even neutral experts do not believe in the possibility of establishing such a state. The same experts are also of opinion that the Pakistan scheme is also impossible, because 41 per cent. of the population in the Pakistan area are not Muslims. For instance, the Sikhs want a 'Sikhistan' within Pakistan.

The three great principles of the 1935 Constitution are, for the Westerners who know India, the only solutions to be applied. These are:—
(1) Federation: (2) Central Responsibilities: (3) Autonomous Units.

According to the Europeans who have studied the problem more deeply it is necessary to search in the Indian question the natural weakness and strength of nationalism. As it is everywhere, nationalism in India is also dominated more by enthusiasm than by reason. Its strength, as well as its weakness, resides in this. Its strength resides in this because there is no greater dynamic strength than ideals, and its weakness is due to the fact that it takes no account of true facts. The Indian nationalism is enthusiastic, but in the presence of natural difficulties it foams and stops.

All the population of India is agreed on one point—their not being British. They do not want British domination. But differences follow immediately. Those of the most extremist section of the Congress who conversed with us told me that the British period in India had been a stage which had brought them upto the independence cause, and they also insisted on the fact that Indian independence did not necessarily mean anti-British." (a)

The Princes

The Princes' Views on the Transfer of Power under Federation—1935.

"Moreover, the treaty of accession was to provide for the transfer of certain powers and jurisdiction of the Indian States, 'for the purpose of the federation only.' In order that these powers so delegated may be exercised by the new federal government and its several organs a situation as contemplated by Clause (45) of the bill had never been discussed with us and conceded. If there was a breakdown of the constitution, it was never contemplated that the powers so transferred by the States were to be exercised by the Governor-General for an indefinite length of time. If the breakdown was not repaired and the machinery of Government was not restored to its normal structure within a certain definite time, the powers transferred by the States must revert to the princes owing to the failure of federation, the sole object of the transfer. Furthermore it must be observed that these power were being made over to the Crown as a trustee for their delegation to the federation to be jointly exercised by British India and the Indian States. It was thus understood that in the event of a breakdown of the federal constitution or an amendment without the consent of the States

(a) Extract from "INDIA IN RETROSPECT," an articles by Falih Rifki-Atay in the 'ULUS,' Ankara, March, 26, 1943, as published in the *Daily Gazette*, Karachi, dated the 10th May, 1943.

beyond such minor changes in respect of which previous consultation may not be necessary by agreement, the trust would be determined and the powers transferred would revert to the States. It need hardly be added that when such a reversion has occurred, the existing relations between the Crown and the States would be again revived. The princes, therefore, urge that this aspect of the delegation of power should be fully recognised with provisions of the constitution act" (a).

Extract from the Secretary of State's reply to the Princes' letter:—

".....A federation is a union of a number of political communities for certain common purposes, and every such union necessarily involves that the sum of the powers of each federating community shall, with its assent, thereafter, be exercised by a central authority or authorities on behalf of all. It is this organic connection between each of them and the central authority which distinguishes a federation from a mere alliance or confederacy. His Majesty's Government have never contemplated a federation of India only as an association in which British India on the one hand and Indian States on the other would do no more than act in concert in matters of common concern. From an early stage discussions have centred on the creation of an organic union between the two with a federal government and a legislature exercising on behalf of both the powers vested in them for that purpose." (b)

The Congress Attitude Towards the States

Extract from the resolutions passed at the February 1938 session of the Indian National Congress:—

"The Congress is not opposed to the idea of Federation, but a real Federation must, even apart from the question of responsibility, consist of free units enjoying more or less the same measure of freedom and civil liberty, and representation by the democratic process of election. The Indian States participating in the Federation should approximate to the provinces in the establishment of representative institutions, responsible government, civil liberties and method of election to the Federal House." (c)

"The Congress stands for the same political, social and economic freedom in the States as in the rest of India, and considers the States as integral parts of India which cannot be separated. The Purna Swaraj,..... which is the objective of the Congress, is for the whole of India..., for the integrity and unity of India must be maintained in freedom as it has been maintained in subjection..." (d)

Federation and Paramountcy

Before the Joint parliamentary Committee on Indian Reforms, on the question of specifying the subjects in respect of which the Princes were to federate, Sir Samuel Hoare said, 'His Majesty's Government have never contemplated a Federation of India only as an association in which British India, on the one hand, and the Indian States, on the other, would do no more than act in

(a) Extract from the Princes' Note accompanying their Letter to H. E. the Viceroy commenting on the Draft Instrument of Accession, vide THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1935, Vol. I, page 442.

(b) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1935, Vol. I, page. 443.

(c) " " " " " " " " 70

(d) " " " " " " " " 71

concert on matters of common concern. From an early stage the discussions have centred on the creation of an organic union between the two, with the Federal executive and legislature, exercising on behalf of both, the powers vested in them for that purpose.' At the end of an acrimonious debate in the House of Commons Sir Samuel Hoare said 'Firstly, the question of Paramountcy is one for consideration in India, and it is to a great extent distinct from the consideration of a federal constitution; secondly, we stand on the principle that the Crown's representative must retain ultimate discretion; thirdly, we recognise there are matters which, by further discussion in India, may be adjusted, while in any case through federation the States will exchange the control of Paramountcy for a due share of constitutional control over a wide field of subjects. Three conclusions I draw from these considerations are:—One, the Bill, far from worsening the position of the Princes in regard to Paramountcy, will make it better. Two, the greater part of the Bill has nothing to do with Paramountcy, which is not mentioned in the Bill. The greater part of the Bill has therefore to be decided on other considerations, and the introduction of Paramountcy into the controversy should in no way complicate or delay our proceeding steadily and normally with the Bill. Three, Paramountcy must be dealt with in a normal way in India. It affects all Princes whether they federate or not and whether the Bill is passed or not.' (a)

A notable contribution to the discussion about the position of the Princes in the future India was made by the Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Sastri in a series of public lectures delivered early in the year. His point was that the increasing emphasis laid by the Princes on the doctrine of Paramountcy of the British Crown had assumed such magnitude that the entire basis of the fabric which British India and the Princes were hoping to realise had changed, and Federation as such threatened to swallow the Dominion Status for which they were till then striving. Under the present Government of India Act it was the Governor General acting with his Council that looked after and maintained all the powers of Paramountcy under the Crown. But when the constitutional machinery of the Government of India was sought to be changed and substituted by Federation, the Princes claimed for the first time that the powers of Paramountcy should in the future Federal Government vest in the Viceroy alone, acting under the Crown, with certain modifications demanded by them. Mr. Sastri argued that so long as the doctrine of the separate individual allegiance of each Prince to the Crown and not to the Federal Government of the future exercising those powers under the Crown was maintained, the dominionhood of India would not be complete. Mr. Sastri called upon the Princes to make three declarations that Dominion Status was the central goal of Indian political evolution: that the army should be completely Indianised within a stated period: and that the Princes would liberalise their administration, set up representative institutions, accept the principle of a privy purse and in other words make their subjects politically efficient. (b)

THE PRINCES AND DOMINION STATUS

The Chamber of Princes at their session at New Delhi on the 12th March, 1940 unanimously adopted the following resolution on the future constitution of India vis-a-vis the Indian Princes:—

"The Chamber of Princes, while welcoming the attainment by India of its due place amongst the Dominions of the British Commonwealth under the British Crown, records its emphatic and firm view—

- (a) that in any future constitution for India, the essential guarantees and safeguards for the preservation of the sovereignty

and autonomy of the States and "for the protection of their rights arising from treaties, sanads, engagements and otherwise should be effectively provided, and that any unit should not be placed in a position to dominate the others or to interfere with the rights and safeguards guaranteed to them and that all parties must be ensured their due share and fairplay;

- (b) that in any negotiations for formulating a constitution for India, whether independently of the Government of India Act, 1935, or by revision of that Act, the representatives of the States and of this Chamber should have a voice proportionate to their importance and historical position.

This Chamber further records its view that any constitutional scheme which may involve the transference of the relationship of the States with the Crown to any other authority without their free and voluntary agreement or which may permit of alterations affecting the rights and interests of the States without their consent, cannot be acceptable to them."

The Chancellor, in moving the resolution, explained briefly what was implied in each part of it. The preamble, he said, stated in clear and unmistakable terms that, subject to certain essential conditions and safeguards, the Indian Princes would welcome the attainment by India of its due place amongst the Dominions of the British Commonwealth under the Crown. It was a carefully considered declaration and was a proof, if proof were needed, that the Indian Princes shared the natural desire of all patriotic Indians that the Motherland should take her due place amongst the free Dominions.

Proceeding, the Jam Saheb said that the Indian Princes had been described by certain interested critics as obstacles in the path of the ordered progress of India and the States. "We have been accused glibly of conspiring with the British Government against the political evolution of our Motherland. These are baseless insinuations, which we emphatically repudiate. Our traditions and our actions belie all such charges. We stand for India attaining its full stature in which all the component parts and interests and classes may be assured the fullest scope for it, under the ægis of the British Crown" he added. "

The second part of the resolution, the Jam Saheb said, laid down three fundamental conditions, which must be the basis of any constitution to which the Princes could subscribe and which were necessary for the stable working of any constitution in the existing circumstances of India. These conditions were, (1) effective provision of essential guarantees and safeguards for the preservation of the sovereignty and autonomy of the States, and for the protection of their rights under treaties, engagements, sanads or otherwise; (2) a specific provision that no unit should be placed in a position to dominate the others or to interfere with the rights and safeguards guaranteed to them; and (3) the assurance that all parties would get their due share and fairplay in the actual working of the constitution. The working of the present constitution in the provincial sphere had already shown that certain safeguards which had been provided in the Act had not worked as contemplated.

Proceeding, the Jam Saheb said, "If India is to progress on the path of ordered evolution, there should be a specific constitutional obligation and a moral code of honour amongst the units composing India, that no unit shall be in a position to dominate or permit unfriendly acts against the others. Let it be clearly understood that the Indian Princes are not averse to progress within their territories. They have already given proof of their *bona fides* in the

matter, by the association of their people with the administration and by laying down the basis of a rule of law and administrative reforms in the States. We are determined to move from precedent to precedent. Nevertheless, we feel that it would be unwholesome if people from one unit, be it a State or a Province, are permitted to march into the territory of the other unit in order to coerce its duly constituted authority to take decisions in matters within its competence. Such tendencies, which have lately exhibited themselves, if not arrested in time, would be an invitation to civil war in the country, which all patriotic Indians must join their hands to avert."

In conclusion, the Chancellor referred to the India of today which he described as "a land of curious paradoxes in the political field." "Some," he said, "asked for solemn undertakings from Britain for India's political progress but preached in the same breath that sacred covenants made with the States might be scrapped. Some asked for self-determination for India, but denied it to those who also constituted India. Others sought to unite India by dividing it. In this sad spectacle," he continued, "those gifted leaders of India who should be busy laying down the foundations of a united Dominion of India are still trying to convince others of their credentials. It seems to me that the time has arrived when leaders of all parties and interests in India should make another earnest attempt to meet and to find a solution of the constitutional problem honourable and fair to all concerned. This, however, postulates a large heart and accommodating statesmanship."

The Maharaja of Bikaner said that, from the time of the first Round Table Conference, the Princes had publicly and unequivocally stated that they welcomed and sympathised with their brethren in British India in their desire to achieve Dominion Status under the aegis of the British Crown. He, therefore, welcomed the announcement made on behalf of the British Government that the goal of British policy in India was the attainment by India of the full status of a Dominion. "The Princes are, however," he continued, "doing nothing more than their duty to their States and to their people in emphasising that essential guarantees and safeguards for the preservation of the sovereignty of the States and for the protection of their rights and interests arising from treaties, sanads and engagements or otherwise, be adequately and effectively provided in a manner fair and acceptable to the Princes. This declaration by the Princes had become necessary because of a tendency, which had recently manifested itself in certain important political quarters, to consider the future of India without taking the States into account. No solution which omitted to take into consideration this fundamental fact of the complete freedom of the States in regard to such matters and their unchallengeable equality with British India could obviously be acceptable to the States."

The Maharaja made it clear that there were not two but three parties namely, the Crown, the Indian States and British India, and any agreement must be tripartite and must be negotiated freely so far as the States were concerned. "The Princes are putting forward these essential conditions for the preservation and the integrity of the States, not for the sake of the continuance of their personal power, nor for maintaining unchanged the nature of their governments. Not, unless the Crown fails in its obligations to the States—a contingency not to be contemplated—can the Princes be asked to give up what is legitimately theirs."

His Highness proceeding said: "It has been alleged in Congress circles that the Princes are an imperial creation; that they are vassals of the Crown and have no status apart from the Crown: that the question of the Princes is a red-herring drawn across the path of India's progress for imperialistic purposes; that the problem of the States is a bogey raised by the British Government, and that if the Crown parts with the power it to-day enjoys over the whole of

India, naturally the Princes have to look up to the successor of the Crown, namely, the whole people of India, for the preservation of their sovereign status. I may here be permitted to say that many States, big as well as small, owe their existence to the strong arm of their former Rulers, and that long before the establishment of the British Empire in India. They have come into political relationship with the Crown by treaties of alliance and friendship and other engagements; and we have not the least doubt that their claims cannot be dismissed in this airy fashion which ignores irrefutable historical facts. If one might point out in all friendliness, it is British India which is the creation of the British Government. The allegation has also been heard that Princes are unfriendly to the Congress. But that is not a correct statement of the position. It is the Congress, however, which has of late shown active hostility to the States, and some of its foremost leaders have expressed the view that they do not want the States in the Federation and that they would tear up the treaties of the States as if they were scraps of paper, and even that they would like to see the States done away with."

The Maharaja of Dewas (Junior) said that it was not very difficult to agree on the ideal of Dominion Status which was well defined and well understood. But what caused difficulty was the manner and the method by which the parties involved sought to give practical shape to it. The Princes had left no room for reasonable doubt that their co-operation would be forthcoming in putting India on the path of progress. The Princes had no illusions that certain sacrifices would be involved in their undertaking to shape the common destiny of the country.

It was not at all certain, His Highness continued, that parliamentary democracy was suited to the genius of the country and was superior to the system of Government that the Princes advocated. Parties in India, he urged, should not ignore the facts as they existed. The Princes historically and traditionally were a basic factor of Indian existence. The States' issue was much more a fact than minority or other problems, which, at their very best, were the products of political expediency. To pretend to ignore this fact or to brush the States aside airily as part and parcel of the Imperial British existence was to do both material and mental violence. It was all the more surprising that it was done by apostles of non-violence.

His Highness proceeded said that the Princes were and would continue to be leaders of their people, and they could not accept the claim of outsiders to self-appointed trusteeship of their people. They could not abrogate the functions that history, tradition, and province (providence?) had entrusted to their care.

In this connection, His Highness referred to the recent statement of Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar that the States' problem was one for preliminary settlement subject to which the ideal of a Constituent Assembly was to be pursued. "So far," he said, "this represents the only attempt at a constructive contribution towards the solution of the Indian States' problem made by any leader from British India."

In conclusion, the Maharaja said: "Some parties in India have claimed that no scheme that has not their consent should be deemed to be accepted by them. Lest the case of the Princes, who have an undoubted stake in the country, go by default, it is our duty to reciprocate the same feeling and record the same sentiment."

The resolution was further supported and carried unanimously.

THE POSITION TODAY

The Constitutional Deadlock in India

Extract from Mr. Amery's speech in the House of Commons on the 14th August, 1940. (a)

The Congress Position

"The constitutional deadlock in India is not so much between His Majesty's Government and a consentient Indian opposition as between the main elements in India's own national life. It can, therefore, only be resolved not by the relatively easy method of a bilateral agreement between His Majesty's Government and representatives of India, but by the much more difficult method of a multilateral agreement in which His Majesty's Government is only one of the parties concerned. There is, first of all, the Indian National Congress. Its leaders have repudiated the Act of 1935 in its Federal aspect as a denial both of India's right to immediate complete Independence and of the principles of democracy. It is in pursuance of that repudiation, because India's consent was not formally invited before she was committed to the war, that they called out the Congress Ministries in the Provinces. Their demand has been that India's Independence should be recognised forthwith and that Indians should devise their own constitution in a Constituent Assembly elected by universal adult suffrage over all India, including the territories of the Indian Princes."

The League's Position

"It is true that they (the Congress) are numerically the largest single party in British India. But their claim in virtue of that fact to speak for India is utterly denied by very important elements in India's complex national life. These other elements assert their right to be regarded not as mere numerical minorities but as separate constituent factors in any future Indian policy entitled to be treated as such in any discussions for the shaping of India's future constitution. The foremost among these elements stands the great Muslim community of ninety millions strong and constituting a majority both in north-western and north-eastern India but scattered as minority over the whole sub-continent. In religious and social outlook, in historic tradition and culture, the difference between them and their Hindu fellow-countrymen goes as deep, if not deeper than any similar difference in Europe. That need not, and does not, prevent pleasant social intercourse of fruitful political co-operation. It has not, in fact, prevented individual Muslims taking an active part in the work of the Congress Party. But, as a body, the Muslims have stood aloof. Their quarrel with the scheme of the existing Act is not that it fails to give that clear majority rule which the Congress asks for but that it would give too great powers to a Hindu majority at the Centre. They will have nothing to do with a Constitution framed by a Constituent Assembly elected by a majority vote in

geographical constituencies. The claim right, in any constitutional discussions, to be regarded as an entity and are determined only to accept a constitution whose actual structure will secure their position as an entity against the operations of a mere numerical majority."

The Position of the Scheduled Castes

"The same, though in a lesser degree, perhaps, applies to the great body of what are known as the Scheduled Castes, who feel, in spite of Mr. Gandhi's earnest endeavours on their behalf, that, as a community, they stand outside the main body of the Hindu community which is represented by the Congress."

The Position of the Princes

"The Indian Princes, again, with territories covering a third of all India and including nearly a quarter of its population, constitute another entity, or group of entities, which refuses to be assimilated to the simple democratic formula propounded by the Congress. They object to the existing scheme as interfering too greatly with their existing powers. They naturally object even more strongly to the proposed Constituent Assembly or to any constitution which might emerge from it. Yet they are an essential element in any Indian Federation. What is more, they can make a valuable contribution to it. In many ways their territories are the most characteristically Indian part of India. They have equally much to gain from a closer contact with the rest of India in the constitutional as well as economic development, but it is idle to suppose that such a development can take place overnight or must be forced upon them before they can be allowed to play their part in a Federal scheme."

Some Dates

1941 7th December	Japan declares war on Britain and the U. S. A.
1942 15th February	Fall of Singapore.
1942 9th March	Fall of Rangoon.

Great Expectations

1942 22nd March

The Cripps Mission

Sir Stafford Cripps reaches Karachi.

The Princes on the Eve of the Cripps Mission (a)

On the eve of the publication of the Cripps Scheme, His Highness the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir issued a public statement which set out the States' outlook on India's future. He said:—

"On the part of the States, a considerable factor in the Indian policy and an important party to be satisfied, there has been a tendency, even within recent weeks, to give prominence to the creed of 'relations to the Crown.' These relations have so far been maintained through, and effected by, a department set up by the will of the Crown the policy and practice of the department being determined by the Crown's functionaries. Logically, therefore, it would seem that the Princes cannot object to having dealings with a central Government of India which the Crown may constitute. Nor have they any reason to assume that they would not get a square deal from

(a) THE INDIAN YEAR BOOK, 1942-43. (*The Times of India Press, Bombay*). Page, 223.

such a Government. In any case, it is the duty of the Princes to show themselves patriots and that they desire that their countrymen should feel themselves the equals of nationals anywhere in the world.

The Princes are justified in assuming that in a self-governing India every autonomous unit will share equally the fiscal and financial advantages accruing in such an India as well as the responsibilities and burdens entailed by the maintenance of peace and order and the provision of beneficent services and public utilities in the territories administered. And it should not be forgotten that these territories may have problems peculiar to their populations as well as to their physical conditions.

In the India of tomorrow such of the Princes' prerogatives as enable them to afford a better life to their subjects and to ameliorate their lot must remain. Other privileges, which may be merely matters of honour and glory shedding effulgence on their personalities are of comparatively small account when set beside other considerations such as the safeguarding of resources necessary for an up-to-date government and the relief of burdens borne by the States alone.

In promising to support the proposals brought by Sir Stafford Cripps, the Chamber of Princes added the proviso that the support would be without prejudice to the right of individual States to lay their case before him and generally without prejudice to the 'inherent rights of the States.'

These rights it is not easy to define or catalogue when one considers the effect of political practice inaugurated in 1860 and since maintained with the aid of 'usage and sufferance.' In any case there is a piquant irony in the contrast between the Princes' reiteration of the phrase 'treaty rights' and the Viceroy's suggestion that all Princes, for certain purposes, should voluntarily abdicate in favour of the political officers accredited to their courts.

When at the Round Table Conference the Princes assented to the working out of a federal constitution, they were prepared voluntarily to delegate some of their sovereign powers to a federal government. In the India of the future it is possible that the matters committed to the Central Government would be far fewer than those recited in the table of federal matters appended to the Act of 1935.

Unless, therefore, the proposals entrusted to Sir Stafford Cripps are fundamentally adverse to the interests of the Indian States—and this is unthinkable—there is no reason why there should not be ample common ground between the States and the rest of India. 'Freedom' must be our watchword—freedom from crippling restrictions and strangling control, freedom from the subordination of India's interests to the interests of other parts of the Commonwealth."

The Cripps Proposals

The text of the offer which Sir Stafford Cripps brought out to India in the name of the British War Cabinet :—(a)

"His Majesty's Government having considered the anxieties expressed in this country and in India as to the fulfilment of promises made in regard to the future of India have decided to lay down in precise and

clear terms the steps which they propose shall be taken for the earliest possible realisation of self-government in India. The object is the creation of a new Indian Union which shall constitute a Dominion associated with the United Kingdom and other Dominions by a common allegiance to the Crown but equal to them in every respect, in no way subordinate in any aspect of its domestic or external affairs. His Majesty's Government, therefore, make the following Declaration:—

- (a) Immediately upon cessation of hostilities steps shall be taken to set up in India in manner described hereafter an elected body charged with the task of framing a new Constitution for India.
- (b) Provision shall be made, as set out below, for participation of Indian States in the Constitution-making body.
- (c) His Majesty's Government undertake to accept and implement forthwith the Constitution so framed subject only to:—
 - (i) The right of any Province of British India that is not prepared to accept the new Constitution to retain its present constitutional position, provision being made for its subsequent accession if it so decides.

With such non-acceding Provinces, should they so desire, His Majesty's Government will be prepared to agree upon a new Constitution giving them the same full status as the Indian Union and arrived at by a procedure analogous to that here laid down.

- (ii) The signing of a Treaty which shall be negotiated between His Majesty's Government and the Constitution-making body. This Treaty will cover all necessary matter arising out of the complete transfer of responsibility from British to Indian hands; it will make provision, in accordance with undertakings given by his Majesty's Government, for the protection of racial and religious minorities; but will not impose any restriction on the power of the Indian Union to decide in future its relationship to other Member States of the British Commonwealth.

Whether or not an Indian State elects to adhere to the Constitution, it will be necessary to negotiate a revision of its Treaty arrangements so far as this may be required in the new situation.

- (d) The Constitution-making body shall be composed as follows unless the leaders of Indian opinion in the principal communities agree upon some other form before the end of hostilities:—

Immediately upon the result being known of Provincial Elections which will be necessary at the end of hostilities, the entire membership of the Lower Houses of Provincial Legislatures shall as a single electoral college proceed to the election of the Constitution-making body by the system of proportional representation. This new body shall be in number about 1/10th of the number of the electoral college

Indian States shall be invited to appoint representatives in the same proportion to their total population as in the case of representatives of British India as a whole and with the same powers as British Indian members.

- (c) During the critical period which now faces India and until the new Constitution can be framed, His Majesty's Government must inevitably bear the responsibility for and retain the control and direction of the defence of India as part of their world-war effort, but the task of organising to the full the military, moral and material resources of India must be the responsibility of the Government of India with the co-operation of the peoples of India. His Majesty's Government desire and invite the immediate and effective participation of the leaders of the principal sections of the Indian people in the counsels of their country, of the Commonwealth and of the United Nations. Thus they will be enabled to give their active and constructive help in the discharge of a task which is vital and essential for the future freedom of India."

In announcing the Scheme, Sir Stafford made it clear that it was only a proposal submitted to the leaders of Indian opinion by the War Cabinet and that its publication was not the publication of a declaration by His Majesty's Government, but only a declaration which they would be prepared to make if it met with sufficiently general and favourable acceptance from the various sections of the Indian people.

The Mission Fails: Rejection by the Congress

The Congress Working Committee passed the following resolution:— (a)

"The Working Committee have given their full and earnest consideration to the proposals made by the British War Cabinet in regard to India and the elucidation thereof by Sir Stafford Cripps.

These proposals, which have been made at the very last hour because of the compulsion of events, have to be considered not only in relation to India's demand for Independence, but more especially in the present grave war crisis, with a view to meeting effectively the perils and dangers that confront India and envelop the world.

The Congress has repeatedly stated, ever since the commencement of the war in September 1939, that the people of India would line themselves with the progressive forces of the world and assume full responsibility to face the new problems and shoulder the new burdens that had arisen, and it asked for the necessary conditions to enable them to do so to be created.

An essential condition was the freedom of India, for only the realisation of present freedom could light the flame which would illumine millions of hearts and move them to action.

At the last meeting of the All-India Congress Committee, after the commencement of the war in the Pacific, it was stated that, 'Only a free and independent India can be in a position to undertake the defence of the country on a national basis and be of help in the furtherance of the larger causes that are emerging from the storm of war.

The British War Cabinet's new proposals relate principally to the future upon the cessation of hostilities.

The Committee, while recognising that self-determination for the people of India is accepted in principle in that uncertain future, regret that this is fettered and circumscribed and certain provisions have been introduced which gravely imperil the development of a free and united nation and the establishment of a democratic state.

Even the constitution-making body is so constituted that the people's right to self-determination is vitiated by the introduction of non-representative elements.

The people of India have as a whole clearly demanded full independence and the Congress has repeatedly declared that no other status except that of independence for the whole of India could be agreed to or could meet the essential requirements of the present situation.

The Committee recognise that future independence may be implicit in the proposals, but the accompanying provisions and restrictions are such that real-freedom may well become an illusion.

The complete ignoring of the ninety millions of the people of the Indian States and their treatment as commodities at the disposal of their rulers is a negation of both democracy and self-determination.

While the representation of an Indian State in the constitution-making body is fixed on a population basis, the people of the States have no voice in choosing those representatives, nor are they to be consulted at any stage, while decisions vitally affecting them are being taken.

Such States may in many ways become barriers to the growth of Indian freedom, enclaves where foreign authority still prevails and where the possibility of maintaining foreign armed forces has been stated to be a likely contingency, and a perpetual menace to the freedom of the people of the States as well of the rest of India.

The acceptance beforehand of the novel principle of non-accession for a province is also a severe blow to the conception of Indian unity and an apple of discord likely to generate growing trouble in the provinces, and which may well lead to further difficulties in the way of the Indian States merging themselves in the Indian Union.

The Congress has been wedded to Indian freedom and unity and any break in that unity, especially in the modern world when people's minds inevitably think in terms of ever larger federations, would be injurious to all concerned and exceedingly painful to contemplate.

Nevertheless the Committee cannot think in terms of compelling the people in any territorial unit to remain in an Indian Union against their declared and established will.

While recognising this principle, the Committee feel that every effort should be made to create conditions which would help the different units in developing a common and co-operative national life.

The acceptance of the principle inevitably involves that no changes should be made which result in fresh problems being created and compulsion being exercised on other substantial groups within that area.

Each territorial unit should have the fullest possible autonomy within the Union, consistently with a strong national state.

The proposal now made on the part of the British War Cabinet encourages and will lead to attempts at separation at the very inception of a union and thus create friction just when the utmost co-operation and goodwill are most needed.

This proposal has been presumably made to meet a communal demand, but it will have other consequences also and lead politically reactionary and obstructionist groups among different communities to create trouble and divert public attention from the vital issues before the country.

Any proposal concerning the future of India must demand attention and scrutiny, but in today's grave crisis, it is the present that counts and even proposals for the future are important in so far as they affect the present.

The Committee have necessarily attached the greatest importance to this aspect of the question, and on this ultimately depends what advice they should give to those who look to them for guidance.

For this present the British War Cabinet's proposals are vague and altogether incomplete, and it would appear that no vital changes in the present structure are contemplated.

It has been made clear that the defence of India will any event remain under British control. At any time defence is a vital subject: during war time it is all important and covers almost every sphere of life and administration. To take away defence from the sphere of responsibility at this stage is to reduce that responsibility to a farce and nullity and to make it perfectly clear that India is not going to be free in any way and her Government is not going to function as a free and independent Government during the pendency of the war.

The Committee would repeat that an essential and fundamental prerequisite for the assumption of responsibility by the Indian people in the present is their realisation as a fact that they are free and are in charge of maintaining and defending their freedom.

What is most wanted is the enthusiastic response of the people which cannot be evoked without the fullest trust in them and the devolution of responsibility on them in the matter of defence.

It is only thus that even at this grave eleventh hour it may be possible to galvanise the people of India to rise to the height of the occasion.

It is manifest that the present Government of India, as well as its provincial agencies, are lacking in competence, and are incapable of shouldering the burden of India's defence. It is only the people of India through their popular representatives who may shoulder this burden worthily. But that can only be done by present freedom, and full responsibility being cast upon them.

The Committee, therefore, is unable to accept the proposals put forward on behalf of the British War Cabinet"

Rejection by the Mahasabha

The All-India Hindu Mahasabha was one of the earliest to reject the Proposals on the ground of the unity of India. The statement issued by the Mahasabha ran:—(a)

There are several points in the declaration which are more or less satisfactory but according to the statement unfortunately made by Sir Stafford

Cripps, the scheme of His Majesty's Government is to be accepted or rejected *in toto*. As some essential features of the scheme are wholly or partially unacceptable to us, the Hindu Mahasabha has no other alternative but to reject the scheme.

One of the cardinal points in the scheme which Sir Stafford has put forward on behalf of the War Cabinet is the right which has been conferred on the provinces of British India to keep out of the Indian Union or Federation. The basic principle of the Hindu Mahasabha is that India is one and indivisible. In religious and cultural aspects there has been recognised the fundamental unity of India by the Hindus throughout the ages, and even unity in political sphere was an accomplished fact in many periods of this country's history. Even during some two centuries of British rule, the political unity of India has been recognised and fostered and this has always been claimed by Britain herself as her finest achievement. Besides, India has been treated as one political and constitutional unit under the Constitution Act of 1935. The right to step out of the Indian Federation will stimulate communal and sectional animosities. The other option given to the non-acceding provinces to set up a rival Pakistan-federating-constitutes, in view of such Moslem movements as Pakistan and Pathanistan involving threats of joining hands with Afghanistan and other Moslem nations, a serious menace to Indian security and unity, and this may lead to civil war in the country. The Hindu Mahasabha cannot be true to itself and to the best interests of Hindustan (India) if it is a party to any proposal which involves the political partition of India in any shape or form.

The Hindu Mahasabha, therefore, has fundamental objections to the proposal. The right of non-accession of any province to the 'Indian Union' cannot be justified on the principle of self-determination, and no such right can be imposed by any outside authority. India has already been one unitary state, and the existing provinces are constituted as administrative units. The analogy of sovereign states entering into a federation and surrendering a portion of their sovereignty for certain common purposes cannot apply to Indian provinces.

According to the scheme of Sir Stafford Cripps, a treaty will be signed between His Majesty's Government and the constituent assembly, and such treaty will implement the undertakings given by His Majesty's Government for the protection of racial and religious minorities. In the framing of this treaty all parties and sections will have an effective say. Such a treaty ought to completely satisfy the minorities. If, however, any minority is not satisfied with the safeguards in the proposed constitution, then the question of such safeguards can be referred to the tribunal of arbitration to be appointed by the constituent assembly in consultation with disputing parties. We want to take our stand on justice and fair play, and we do not ask for any rights or privileges which we are not prepared to extend to any community.

The Hindu Mahasabha is not so much concerned with a declaration as to the future but the real question is whether England is willing to transfer immediately real political power to India and, if so, to what extent. It notes with regret that the scheme which Sir Stafford Cripps has announced is nebulous, vague and unsatisfactory with regard to the interim arrangements. The Government of India Act of 1935 still maintains the bureaucracy in power with the Governor-General and the Governors as their powerful protagonists. But for successful prosecution of the war it is essential to

transfer real power to Indian hands and to set up conventions whereby Indian ministers can formulate and execute a policy of national defence, including the formation of a national militia and the arming of the Indian people for the defence of the country.

It has been the demand of the Hindu Mahasabha that India should be immediately declared an independent nation with free and equal status in the Indo-British Commonwealth. The declaration promises full national sovereignty in the future but the constitutional position and status of India during the interim period have not been made at all clear.

Particularly in regard to defence, the scheme of His Majesty's Government is unacceptable to us. It is urgent and imperative that if India is to be an effective partner in the struggle for freedom, her defence policy must be determined and her defence arrangements must be made on the responsibility of her own defence minister enjoying the confidence of all sections of the people. The tragic experiences of Malaya and Burma have demonstrated that apart from the deplorable failure of military strategy, the apathy and hostility of the people who were deliberately kept unarmed, contributed to the British reverses. The psychology necessary for full and willing co-operation in the present war amongst the Indian people cannot be created unless and until the defence of India is put in Indian hands.

We note with satisfaction that this scheme provides for a constitution-making body for framing the future constitution of India, and that the constituent assembly may begin its work with the declaration of India's independence. But the principle on which it will be constituted is vicious. The constitution-making body will be elected on the basis of the Communal Award which is not only anti-national but runs counter to the essential principles of democracy.

Unless and until the scheme of His Majesty's Government is radically altered and re-adjusted on the vital issues mentioned above, the Hindu Mahasabha cannot be a party to its acceptance inasmuch as the scheme is to be accepted or rejected *in toto*."

Rejection by the Hindu Depressed Classes

"Dr. Ambedkar and Mr. Rajah who claim to speak for the depressed classes, complained of a "breach of faith" made no positive suggestions for amendment and rejected proposals which would, they said, 'place them under an unmitigated system of Hindu rule.' " (a)

Rejection by the Sikhs

The Sikh All-Parties Committee in a representation to Sir Stafford Cripps declared that the proposals were unacceptable to them because: (b)

"Instead of maintaining and strengthening the integrity of India, specific provision has been made for separation of provinces and the constitution of Pakistan and the cause of the Sikh community has been lamentably betrayed. Ever since the British advent our community has fought for England in every battlefield of the Empire, and this is our

(a) H. N. Brailsford's "Subject India," page 57.

(b) THE INDIAN YEAR BOOK, 1942-43, (The Times of India Press, Bombay) pp. 837-8.

reward, that our position in the Punjab, which England promised to hold in trust, and in which we occupied a predominant position has been finally liquidated.

Why should a province that fails to secure 3/5th majority of its legislature in which a religious community enjoys statutory majority, be allowed to hold a plebiscite and given the benefit of a bare majority? In fairness this right should have been conceded to communities who are in permanent minority in the legislature.

Further, why could not the population of any area opposed to separation be given the right to record its verdict and to form an autonomous unit? We are sure you know that the Punjab proper extended upto the banks of the Jhelum excluding Jhang and Multan districts, and the trans-Jhelum area was added by the conquest of Maharaja Ranjit Singh and retained by the British for administrative convenience. It would be altogether unjust to allow extraneous trans-Jhelum population which only, accidentally came into the province to dominate the future of the Punjab proper.

We give below the figures which abundantly prove our contention. From the boundary of Delhi to the banks of the Ravi river the population is divided as follows:—

Muslims	45.05,000
Sikhs and other non-Muslims ..	76.46,000

From the Delhi boundary to the banks of the Jhelum river excluding Multan and Jhang districts:—

Muslims	82,88,000
Sikhs and other non-Muslims ..	93,48,000

To this may be added the population of the Sikh States of Patiala, Nabha, Jind, Kapurthala and Faridkot, which is about 26,00,000. Of this the Muslims constitute barely 20 per cent. and this reduces the ratio of Muslim population still further.

We do not wish to labour the point any more. We have lost all hope of receiving any consideration. We shall resist, however, by all possible means separation of the Punjab from the All-India Union. We shall never permit our Motherland to be at the mercy of those who disown it."

Rejection by the League

The proposals of the British War Cabinet were examined carefully by the Muslim League Working Committee which, whilst rejecting the scheme, expressed gratification that the possibility of Pakistan was recognised by implication by providing for the establishment of two or more independent unions in India. It is regretted that the proposals of His Majesty's Government embodying the fundamentals were not open to any modification and therefore no alternative proposals were invited, and passed the following resolutions:—

"In view of the rigidity of the attitude of His Majesty's Government with regard to the fundamentals not being open to any modifications, the Committee have no alternative but to say that the proposals in their present form are unacceptable.

- (1) The Mussalmans, after 25 years of genuine efforts for the reconciliation of the two major communities and the bitter

experience of the failure of such efforts, are convinced that it is neither just nor possible, in the interest of peace and happiness of the two peoples, to compel them to constitute one Indian Union, composed of the two principal nations—Hindus and Muslims—which appears to be the main object of His Majesty's Government, as adumbrated in the preamble of the draft declaration, the creation of more than one union being relegated only to the realm of remote possibility and is purely illusory.

- (2) In the draft declaration a constitution-making body has been proposed with the primary object of creating one Indian Union. So far as the Muslim League is concerned, it has finally decided that the only solution of India's constitutional problem is the partition of India into independent zones; and it will, therefore, be unfair to the Mussalmans to compel them to enter such a constitution-making body, whose main object is the creation of a new Indian Union. With conditions as they are, it will be not only futile but on the contrary may exacerbate bitterness and animosity amongst the various elements in the country.

Besides, the machinery which has been proposed for the creation of the constitution-making body, namely, that it will consist of members elected by the newly elected lower houses of the eleven provinces, upon the cessation of hostilities, as a single electoral college by the system of proportional representation, is a fundamental departure from the right of the Mussalmans, hitherto enjoyed by them, to elect their representatives by means of separate electorates, which is the only sure way in which true representatives of the Mussalmans can be chosen.

The constitution-making body will take decisions by a bare majority on all questions of most vital and paramount character involved in the framing of the constitution, which is a departure from the fundamental principles of justice and contrary to constitutional practice so far followed in the various countries and dominions; and the Mussalmans, by agreeing to this will, instead of exercising their right and judgment as a constituent factor, be at the entire mercy of the constitution-making body in which they will be a minority of about 25 per cent.

The right of non-accession to the Union as contemplated in the draft declaration has been conceded presumably in response to the insistent demands by the Mussalmans for the partition of India but the method and procedure laid down are such as to negative the professed object, for in the draft proposals the right of non-accession has been given to the existing provinces which have been formed from time to time for administrative convenience and on no logical basis.

The Mussalmans cannot be satisfied with such a declaration on a vital question affecting their future destiny and demand a clear and precise pronouncement on the subject. Any attempt to solve the future problem of India by a process of evading the real issues is to court disaster.

In the draft proposals no procedure has been laid down as to how the verdict of the province is to be obtained in favour of or

against accession to the one Union: but in the letter dated 2nd of April from the Secretary of Sir Stafford Cripps, addressed to the President of the All-India Muslim League, it is stated that "a province should reach the decision whether or not to stand out of the Union by a vote in the Legislative Assembly on a resolution to stand in."

If the majority for accession to the Union is less than 60 per cent. the minority will have the right to demand a plebiscite of the adult male population." In this connection it must be emphasised that in the case of the major provinces of Bengal and the Punjab they (the Muslims) are in a minority in the Legislative Assemblies, and in the Assemblies of Sind and the North-West Frontier Province, the total number, namely, 60 and 50 respectively, is so small and the weightage given to the non-Muslims so heavy that it can be easily manipulated and a decision under such conditions cannot be the true criterion of ascertaining the real opinion of the Mussalmans of those provinces.

As regards the suggested plebiscite in the provinces in which the Mussalmans are in a majority, in the event of the requisite majority not being available in the Legislative Assemblies, the procedure laid down is that reference shall be made to the whole adult population of the provinces and not to the Mussalmans alone, which is to deny them the inherent right to self-determination.

- (4) With regard to the Indian States, it is the considered opinion of the Committee that it is a matter for them to decide whether to join or not to join or form a union.
- (5) With regard to the treaties to be negotiated between the Crown and the Indian Union or Unions, the proposals do not indicate as to what would happen in case of disagreement on the terms between the contracting parties nor is there any provision made as to what would be the procedure when there is a difference of opinion in negotiating a revision of treaty arrangements with the Indian States in the new situation.
- (6) With regard to the interim arrangement, there is no definite proposal except the bare statement that His Majesty's Government desire and invite the effective and immediate participation of the leaders of the principal sections of the Indian people in the counsels of their country, of the Commonwealth and of the United Nations. The Committee are, therefore, unable to express their opinion until a complete picture is available.

Another reason why the Committee are unable to express their opinion on the interim arrangements for participation in the counsels of the country is that Sir Stafford Cripps has made it clear that the scheme goes through as a whole or is rejected as a whole and that it would not be possible to retain only the part relating to the immediate arrangements at the Centre and discard the rest of the draft scheme and as the Committee has come to the conclusion that the proposals for the future are unacceptable, it will serve no useful purpose to deal further with the question of the immediate arrangement.

In conclusion the Committee wish to point out that the position of the Muslim league has been and is that unless the principles of Pakistan

scheme, as embodied in the Lahore Resolution of March 1940, which is now the creed of the All-India Muslim League, is unequivocally accepted and the right of the Mussalmans to self-determination is conceded by means of a machinery which will reflect the true verdict of Muslim India, it is not possible for the Muslim League to accept any proposal or scheme regarding the future." (a)

Tide Turns

- 1942 2nd July The Germans held in Egypt.
 December The Germans driven from Egypt and Lybia.
 1943 January The Germans driven from Tripolitania, and the Allied advance into Tunisia.
 8th May The Germans rolled back from the Caucasus. The capture by the Allies of Tunis and Bizerta.
 13th May The Axis surrender and their elimination from Africa.

Frustration

- 1942 8th August "QUIT INDIA" Resolution adopted by the All-India Congress Committee.
 9th August Mahatma Gandhi, the Congress Working Committee, and the All-India Congress Committee arrested.
 20th August THE LEAGUE JUSTIFIES ITS STAND-OUT:—
 MUSLIM LEAGUE WORKING COMMITTEE
 RESOLUTION, BOMBAY.

"The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, having given their deep and anxious consideration to the present political development in the country, deplore the decision arrived at by the All-India Congress Committee on August 8 to launch an 'open rebellion' by resorting to mass civil disobedience in pursuance of their objective of establishing a Congress-Hindu domination in India, which resulted in lawlessness and considerable destruction of life and property.

It is the considered opinion of the Working Committee that this movement is directed not only to coerce the British Government into handing over power to a Hindu oligarchy, and thus disabling themselves from carrying out their moral obligations and pledges given to the Mussalmans and other sections of the people of India from time to time, but also to force the Mussalmans to submit and surrender to the Congress terms and dictation.

Ever since the beginning of the war, and even prior to that, the sole objective of the Congress policy had been either to cajole or coerce the British Government into surrendering power to the Congress—a Hindu body with a microscopic following of other communities—in utter suppression of the 100 millions of Mussalmans, besides millions of other peoples of this vast sub-continent of India.

sterile results, and has now culminated in the open defiance of law and order. Since the commencement of hostilities, the Muslim League has been ready and willing, either singly or in co-operation with other parties, to shoulder the responsibility for running the administration and mobilising the resources of the country for the war effort, for the defence of India if a real share of power and authority of Government at the centre and in the provinces is conceded within the framework of the present constitution and, in pursuance of this policy, the Muslim League accepted the underlying principle of the August offer of 1940 of the British Government.

But Government, in supplementing the offer, nullified the essential principles of it and so made it impossible for the Muslim League to co-operate with the Government on honourable terms. In spite of the fact that the British Government spurned the offer of co-operation of the Muslim League, still, under the imminent shadow of the Japanese menace, the Muslim League once again reiterated their offer by their resolution of December 27, 1941, to the following words: 'In view of the fact that the entry of Japan in the war on the side of Axis Powers has brought danger much closer to India and forced into greater prominence the question of the defence of India, the Working Committee consider it necessary to reiterate that the Muslim League from the very beginning expressed its willingness to share responsibility of the defence of the country as is evident from the stand taken by the President of the All-India Muslim League as far back as November 1939. The Working Committee once again declare that they are ready and willing as before to shoulder the burden of the defence of the country, singly or in co-operation with other parties, on the basis of a real share and responsibility given in the authority of Government at the Centre and the Provinces within the framework of the present constitution but without prejudice to the major political issues involved in framing the future constitution.'

But the British Government completely ignored the offer of the Muslim League. While the proposals of Sir Stafford Cripps virtually conceded the Congress demands, the right of secession from the British Commonwealth of Nations and forming a Constituent Assembly with a preponderantly Hindu Majority for framing the post-war constitution, they merely recognised the possibility of establishing Pakistan supposed to be implicit in the non-accession scheme." (a)

The Bus that was missed.

1942 8th September HINDU MAHASABHA PLAN FOR SETTLEMENT.

A ten-point plan for the Indo-British settlement was put forward by Dr. Shyam Prasad Mukherji, Working

(a) The Daily Gazette, Karachi, dated the 24th August 1942.

President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, in the course of his explanatory talks with the Government of India spokesman and leaders of political groups. His proposals were:— (a) •

1. The British Government should declare that India's freedom is formally recognised.
2. The Viceroy or any one deputed by the British Cabinet will be authorised to negotiate with the Indian political parties regarding the formation of an Indian National Government to whom power will be transferred.
3. The Indian National Government will declare its determination to fight the Axis Powers and it will not conclude a separate peace with the enemy.
4. The war policy of India will be in accordance with the policy as determined by the Allied War Councils on which India will be represented.
5. The Commander-in-Chief will remain in charge of operational control of the war in India and will carry out the common policy of the Allied War Councils. The Indian National Government will be able to raise an Indian Army whose aim will be to help in the maintenance of internal security and also defend the country against foreign aggression.
6. The National Government will be composite in character and will include representatives of important parties and groups in the country. It will set up Provincial Governments also on a similar basis.
7. The membership of the Central and Provincial cabinets will not be confined to the members of legislatures but may include outsiders who may wield influence in the country and may be of special assistance during the period of the war.
8. The Indian National Government will concentrate on an active policy of industrialisation and economic uplift of India so that India may effectively prosecute the war.
9. India office will be abolished.
10. As regards the future constitution, the Indian National Government in due course will take necessary steps for the formation of a Constituent Assembly for the purpose. There will be a treaty between Great Britain and India which will specially deal with minority rights. In any case a minority will have the right to refer any proposal regarding the future constitution to the arbitration of an international tribunal in case it considers such a step to be necessary

for 'the protection of its' just rights. The decision of such a tribunal will be binding on the Indian Government and on the majority concerned. The Viceroy as representative of the British Crown should be authorised to deal with the Indian problem with a definite mandate from the British Government."

1942 10th September Mr. CHURCHILL ON THE SETTLED POLICY OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT. (a)

Speaking in the House of Commons Mr. Churchill said:—

"The course in India has been improving and is on the whole re-assuring. The broad principles of the declaration made by the British Government which formed the basis of the mission of the Lord Privy Seal, Sir Stafford Cripps, to India must be taken as representing the settled policy of the British Crown and Parliament. These principles stand in their full scope and integrity. No one can add to them and no one can take anything away.

The good offices of Sir Stafford Cripps were rejected by the Indian Congress Party. This, however, does not end the matter. The Indian Congress Party does not represent All-India, (cheers). It does not represent the majority of the people of India, (cheers). It does not even represent the Hindu masses, (cheers). It is a political organisation built around party machine and sustained by certain manufacturing and financial interests! (cheers and laughter).

Outside that Party and fundamentally opposed to it are 90 million Muslims in British India (here a member interjected: 'nonsense' and there were cries of 'order') who have their rights of self-expression: 50 million Depressed Classes, or untouchables as they are supposed to defile their Hindu co-religionists by their presence or by their shadow; and 95 million subjects of the Princes of India with whom we are bound by treaty; in all these are 235 millions in All-India. This takes no account of the large elements among the Hindus, Sikhs and Christians in British India who deplore the present policy of the Congress Party.

It is necessary that these main facts should not be overlooked here or abroad because no appreciation of the Indian problem or of the relations between India and Britain is possible without the recognition of these basic data..."

1942 30th September Mr. AMERY ON BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

(Speech at Caxton House, London, 29-9-42) (b)

"The subject on which I am to address you is India's future. I do not, therefore, propose to do more than

(a) *The Daily Gazette*, Karachi, dated the 11th September 1942.

(b) *The Times of India*, Bombay, dated 2nd October 1942,

touch in a briefest outline upon India's past or upon her much debated present. I need not go into the amazing story of how in the sheer anarchy of the 18th century in India, at times under the menace of French aggression, the local agents of a British trading concern found themselves compelled progressively to take over an ever widening field of authority. In the end, when that authority had covered the whole of the vast Indian sub-continent in fact became an Empire. Parliament here found itself obliged to assume ultimate responsibility for its security, good government and exercise a limited regulating and controlling influence.

Nevertheless, what is called British rule in India is essentially an institution native to the soil of India.

It has been created by British leadership profoundly influenced by British conceptions of standards, above all by the conception of the reign of law which is the foundation of our liberties. But at every stage in building up the vast structure Indians have played their part, and in the last generation an ever-increasing part, both in civil administration and the fighting forces.

At this moment, all out of the 15 members of the Governor-General's Executive are Indian. Ministries which control administration in five great provinces with a population of some 110,000,000 are Indian responsible to elected Indian legislatures. The same was the case, and would be the case today in the other six Provinces, but for the decision of Mr. Gandhi and the so-called 'High Command' of the Congress Party, which forced the Congress Ministries of those Provinces to go on strike in order to embarrass the Central Government.

Fully half the senior administration services and an overwhelming majority of subordinate services are Indian. The Indianisation of the officer ranks of the Indian army, a more recent development, is proceeding steadily and has already justified itself in action. Nor should we ever lose out of sight the fact that the Government of a quarter population and nearly half the area of India has throughout remained entirely in the hands of Indian rulers, who are protected by treaties loyally observed on both sides, and are an essential part of the fabric of the Indian Empire of today, and an indispensable element in the entirely self-governing India of tomorrow.

Out of the past, which I have thus briefly sketched, has grown the India of the present in all its manifold aspects. I will touch upon two of these. One is the India which is playing so great a part in the present war. It is the India of a great fighting tradition, which raised more than a million volunteers to join the army, in which British and Indian elements have co-operated in splendid

mutual 'loyalty and affection', an army that has covered itself with glory in many a hard-fought field in this war.

It is the India of important industries which is contributing a steadily increasing share of munitions equipment of its own and other Empire armies. It is the India of immense agricultural and mineral resources which its highly developed transport and irrigation systems have made available for the common cause. It is the India which has played and is destined increasingly to play a major part in the war whether in the field or as an arsenal and base of operations.

Side by side with this India that is waging war, there is an India which is concerned with the political issue and India's future government, both in its internal structure and in its relation to this country and to the British Commonwealth as a whole. On the latter issue there is no divergence of aim, whether between Indians themselves (a). We in this country are at one in wishing to see India administering her own affairs, free to control her own destiny, remaining of her own free choice a member of that free partnership of nations which is known as the British Commonwealth. That this should come about is in our eyes the crowning consummation of our past work in India.

Indians of all communities and classes and Princes no less than party leaders in British India are equally anxious that India should govern herself free from all external control.

The difficulty lies in finding a system of Government under which the various complex and profoundly divergent elements of India's national life can both govern themselves in such fashion that no one element should be in a position to oppress another and yet retain substantially that unity of administration and law which has been built up in the past.

For, without that, India can neither be prosperous and at peace within her own borders nor secure against aggression from without. The problem is one of immense difficulty. But it can and, I believe, will be solved. In the main, it must be solved by Indians for themselves, who have agreed to compromises and concessions upon which it must inevitably be based, who will be eager to make the working of that constitution a success. That is why the American constitution works, our British constitution works and that is why the Dominion constitutions work. No imposed constitution, least of all one imposed by one element or party in India upon the rest of India can live.

Yet, that is in essence the aim of Mr. Gandhi and a handful of his associates who control the Congress

party machine. To enforce that aim they decided to launch a campaign of mass sabotage intended, by its paralysing effect on the internal administration and on the defence of India, to bring Government to their knees. To yield to that demand would spell disaster, not only to India's immediate war effort but to all hope of any agreed foundation for India's future freedom and unity.

The defeat of the present attempt to seize control of India in the interests of party dictatorship is an essential condition of any real constitutional solution. That a solution will be found I have no doubt, and it is upon that assumption that I shall now invite you to consider problems that will face the India Government enjoying unfettered control of India's destiny at home in relation to the outside world.

The first problem will be that of India's defence. Whatever arrangements the United Nations may agree upon after the war in order to prevent an early revival of aggressive ambitions on the part of our defeated enemies, we none of us now cherish the illusion that world peace can be preserved cheaply by merely setting up some scheme of international machinery. The spirit of aggression and organised power behind it may revive in many forms and the desire of peace-loving nations to maintain common peace will be of little avail without the backing of effective armed preparation. The preparation, moreover, must be on a scale and character to meet the conditions of future warfare. It will be essentially mechanical, whether in the air, on land or at sea. It must consequently be based on highly developed mechanical industries, with all the mechanical skill which they create. It will be an immensely costly demand, as its foundation is great economic resources and large revenues. The present war has shown the helplessness of small poor countries in the face of the bombers, tanks or fleets of great Powers, and the folly of thinking that they can rely on well-meaning neutrality. It is only as members of some definitely associated league or group that they can assure their safety in future.

How will India stand in that respect? Her latent resources, material and human, are such that, given domestic peace and wise leadership, nothing should prevent her from attaining a position in which she could create and afford, without undue sacrifice, all the defensive equipment of a great power. She is far from being in that position today. To construct, man and pay for the vast fleets of warships, aeroplanes and tanks required for the single-handed defence of her territory and her trade will for a very considerable period be beyond her capacity. For that period, at least if she is to develop in peace and safety she will have to look to some stable alliance or association with others whose interests coincide with hers.

In the interval she will be concerned to build up her industries and create skilled organisers and technicians essential to lead and man her industries and fighting services. Even more fundamental will be the task of raising the standard of living and education of her vast agricultural population in order to create that surplus output of ability above the needs of mere existence, which is the true measure of a nation's strength. There, too, India has within her borders most, though not all, of the resources on which in course of time she could build up her economic strength in isolation.

But the process would be painfully slow, compared with that which she might achieve by a wise development of her external trade and by judicious encouragement of foreign capital investment. What her policy should be in that respect must depend largely on the general course of economic policy in the world outside. There are those who, I know, believe that after the war we shall somehow succeed in reviving the economic individualist internationalism of the last century, in which trade investments were supposed to be matters of purely private concern and entirely divorced from questions whether of domestic social policy or of defence. I cannot see that coming about. The whole trend of the world towards a more organised and planned scheme of life in the interests not only of defence, but even more of social welfare and stability, is bound to involve a greater measure of national direction of trade. This does not mean that there will not be an ever increasing volume of international trade investment. But whether actually carried on by individuals for private profit, or by State agencies, it will be largely governed by national considerations.

International economic co-operation will, in fact, be essentially co-operation among nations as such for their mutual benefit, rather than co-operation among individuals governed exclusively by considerations of private gain. It will be co-operation in which general policy and, not the least, defence policy will necessarily play its part. It is difficult to imagine nations in the future remaining serenely indifferent to their citizens supplying probable, almost certain, enemies with materials essential for war upto the very outbreak of hostilities, as we did with Germany, or the Americans with Japan.

If I am right, then there will almost inevitably be a tendency for nations which look to mutual co-operation in defence, also to look to economic co-operation for their common welfare in peace and for their common strength in the hour of danger. A tendency to group will grow, and those who stand out by isolation and neutrality may well find themselves at a disadvantage in peace as well as in time of war. For some considerable time, at any rate, it seems to me that Indian statesmanship, guided solely by practical consideration of India's interests, will naturally wish to secure or retain for India the

defensive and economic advantages of some suitable external association. Where can they best find it?

To answer the question, we must consider not only the geographical conditions affecting India's defence and trade but also such more intimate factors as racial and cultural traditions and historical associations. Geographically the Indian sub-continent is the southern projection of the vast continental block of which the western projection is called Europe. But it is also—and this is even more important for India—the central feature of a great semi-circle of countries which lie round the Indian Ocean. Her back is turned towards Asia, and her face towards the southern sea.

Ever since the opening up of the high seas, her contacts with Asia, whether for trade or for defence, have mattered far less to her than her contacts overseas. Her mountain frontiers are a serious obstacle alike to trade and invasion. Her long coast-line is a standing invitation to both. From the viewpoint of the defence of both her territory and trade the most important issue is the friendship of whoever commands the Indian Ocean itself and its gateways at Cape Town, Suez, Singapore and Darwin.

Both for trade and for defence the Indian Ocean may well become what the Mediterranean was to the ancient world, a natural link between all countries surrounding it, and in that development India might well aspire to a dominant position, and the meeting in Delhi during this war of the Eastern Group Conference and co-operation in the production of munitions might well prove to have been the fore-runner of greater things to come.

Ah, but it will be said 'what has India to do with Europe and South Africa and Australia and New Zealand?' She is part of Asia and a natural development of the future is 'Asia for Asiatics' and that it is towards China or Japan that India's natural affinities will lead her. I believe that will be a profound mistake. There is no such thing really as an Asiatic, and of the great racial and cultural divisions of the old world India's racial origins and historical and political associations and traditions have linked her from the days of Alexander the Great through the long centuries of Muslim infiltration and the subsequent two centuries of British influence far more closely with the world of Europe and the Middle East than with the fundamentally different history and outlook of the Mongolian Far East.

Above all British influence on India's legal and political thought, not to speak of the use of the English language as a common medium of intercourse between Indians of different home languages, all make association with countries of British tradition easier and more natural for Indians. Add to that the sheer practical difficulties of immediate disentanglement from the existing connection in defence and administration, and it would seem as a mere matter of practical convenience and advantage that

by far the best policy for India during the period before she can afford to stand alone is to retain her association with the free partnership of the British Commonwealth.

There is no political partnership in the world exacting so little from members which, I believe, in the long run can give so much in return.

I have been talking on a purely material and practical plane, looking at the future exclusively from the viewpoint of India's interests. You may well ask the question 'What about Britain's interests?' Looking at the matter from the narrower viewpoint of this island alone, it would, I admit, be difficult to argue that the moral obligation to help India in time of danger is not likely to involve a far greater strain upon our whole defensive organisation and our foreign policy than would be compensated for by Indians' military help or by the additional trade we might possibly get from such preferential advantages as India might concede our trade.

From that narrower standpoint the association with India might well be more of a burden than an asset, and we might have good practical reason for telling that we wished to be quit of her.

On the other hand if we look at the matter from the broader viewpoint of the Commonwealth as a whole, taking into account the interests of other British territories in the southern hemisphere as well as interests in the Middle East, there is a much stronger case for arguing that India as a member of the Commonwealth partnership would probably be on balance and in the long run, if not firstly, will contribute as much as she would receive.

If, therefore, we believe on practical grounds that the British Commonwealth as a whole is worth keeping together, we might also conclude that it will be as much to the Commonwealth's advantage to continue association with India as in India's interests to remain associated with the Commonwealth.

That brings me to a much more fundamental question. Is the continuance and development of the British Commonwealth something really worthwhile, either from our own viewpoint or from that of the world at large? Is it merely a system of mutual co-operation and insurance among a particular group of nations concerned only with the self-regarding interests of its members? Or is it not something far more significant and hopeful for mankind? Is it not a unique experiment in the direction of securing unity of political action in essentials between free nations without the sacrifice of their several national identity or their control of every aspect of their national life?

Such unity, not based on the domination of a master State, not even on the rigid structure and sacrifice of individual nationality involved in a Federation, but on

common ideals and mutual loyalties, is surely something well worth trying out, both for ourselves, and as an example to others—in a world in which the need for larger unities for getting away from the present political and economic anarchy is becoming increasingly urgent.

Is it not in this direction, in the direction of leagues of like-minded free nations, that a true 'new order' of the world's immediate future is to be sought? And if such a league can successfully include in equal freedom and responsibility not only nations of kindred origin, but nations so far apart as the people of India and those of this island and the Dominions of European stock, cutting across all divisions of colour, race and creed, shall we not have advanced an immense step towards the evolution of that future free League of Mankind, which is the ultimate hope of the world, but which is unlikely to be reached by any mere mechanical scheme for an immediate millennium?

If so, then the case for India's remaining in the partnership of the British Commonwealth, not only for the period of transition, but permanently, and for our desiring to remain, therein, is based on grounds even stronger than that of the aeroplanes we can furnish to each other in war or the trade which we can offer each other in peace. It is based on beliefs and hopes which go to the very foundation of the spiritual nature of our peoples. Even more than on the practical commonsense of both sides, it is on the deeper idealism, both of the Indian and British peoples, that must depend the future relations of a free India to the Commonwealth in which, and through the influence of whose ideals, she will have found both her unity and her freedom!"

Mr. Brailsford on the Future

"Let us now turn to the future. I think it unlikely that any fresh attempt to reach a settlement will be made by the British Government, until the war is over. Certainly none will be made until Lord Linlithgow's prolonged viceregal reign ends in October, 1943. I assume with even greater confidence that no attempt by Indians can succeed, or will be encouraged, so long as Gandhi is in prison and Congress remains in revolt. The realists of Whitehall and New Delhi may reckon that when the war is won, or as good as won, our prestige and authority will have been recovered; while available military resources will be unlimited and our dependence on American goodwill will no longer hamper us. In short, we may then be able to deal with the Indians as Empires are wont to deal with subject peoples, though it is understood that the offer of Dominion Status stands, as also do our peculiar relations with the Muslim League and the Princes. By postponing a decision, any liquidation of the Empire, to use Mr. Churchill's phrase, can be averted.

These realists may have vision, a gift of which they have given little proof in the past. For my part I can cast a less flattering horoscope. It is possible that India has escaped the danger of invasion. That is for her and for us a stroke of undeserved good fortune. But it has its political

disadvantages. It means that there will be no fall of patriotic sentiment to our side. In that case, the longer we delay a settlement, the more will Indian opinion, over an ever-widening surface, harden against us. That is happening already. Of late both the Hindu Mahasabha and the Muslim League have threatened, though in vague terms, to resort to direct action. They will not do it; wealthy conservatives do not court imprisonment. None-the-less, their threats do mean something important. They mean that these rivals perceive that the revolt of Congress has added to its popularity. India today is no place for conservatives and it may be an even less congenial sphere of activity for such groups on the day after tomorrow." (a)

1942 10th November "WE MEAN TO HOLD OUR OWN"

(Extract from Mr. Churchill's speech at Mansion House, London) (b)

"We have entered the war not for profit or expansion, but only for honour, and to do our duty in defending the right. Let me, however, make this clear. We mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. I am proud to be a member of the vast Commonwealth and Society of Nations gathered around the ancient British Monarchy without which the good cause might well have perished. Here we stand a veritable rock of salvation in a drifting world. We have no need to make excuses or apologies for our record pleads for us."

Meantime, the India of which Mr. Amery spoke in the House of Commons on 29th September 1942, the India "which is playing so great a part in the present war," (c) continued to play its great part thereby effectively neutralising the pressure of the "political India" and while on

1942 16th November addressing the All-India Muslim Students Conference at Jullunder, Mr. Jinnah repeated the Muslim League's offer 'to mobilise the Mussalmans to keep the enemy out of India's doors and form a provisional government under which the real power should be transferred provided the British Government made a declaration and the other parties agreed to the Muslim right of self-determination and guaranteed and pledged themselves to give effect to the verdict of a Muslim plebiscite regarding Pakistan' (d).

Dr. Ambedkar, the Depressed Classes Leader, afforded to the British Government further re-assurance when he declared about the same time that "it would in no sense be fatal if the solution of the present Indian deadlock was postponed till after the war," adding "that the different political parties had raised their political values much beyond the normal level and any solution arrived at in the present inflated value would only prove fatal to the future India." (e)

(a) "SUBJECT INDIA", by H. N. BRAILSFORD, page 166.

(b) The *Daily Gazette*, Karachi, 11th November, 1942.

(c) Page 60 ante

(d) The *Daily Gazette*, Karachi, 17th November, 1942

(e) " " " " " " "

Perhaps, out of sheer exasperation, the Non-Party Leaders Conference that met at Allahabad on the

1942 16th December "expressed themselves in favour of conceding the fright of Pakistan to the Muslims" (a)

Approved statecraft demanded that the contemplated move which threatened to bring about a possible reconciliation between the warring elements, however superficial its effect might prove to be, must be countered at once. So, on.

1942 17th December, addressing the annual session of the Associated Chambers of Commerce at Calcutta, His Excellency the Viceroy observed, *inter alia*, (b)

"Geographically, India for all practical purposes is one. I would judge it to be as important as ever in the past, nay more important, that we should seek to conserve that unity in so far as it may be built up consistently with full justice for the rights and legitimate claims of the minorities, whether those minorities be great or small. That would be a desirable aim. Can India speak with the authority she is entitled to claim? Can she play her part effectively in international discussions, in discussions with other parts of the Empire, if she is to speak with two voices? Indian unity, subject, as I have said, to full and sufficient provisions for the minorities accepted as such by those minorities, is of great and real importance if Indians want to carry the weight which she ought to carry in the counsels of the Empire and the world.

There are, however, hard practical issues that have to be faced before any true solution can be found. Political opinion in all responsible quarters must discover the middle road along which all men of goodwill may march. Mere artificial unity, without genuine agreement among the component parts, may well be a danger rather than an advantage; for fissures that reveal themselves under pressure from outside are more dangerous than fissures the existence of which is wellknown and can be provided against.

It is through understanding between party and party, between community and community, understanding that begets trust and confidence, understanding that is based on liberal acceptance by the parties to its historical traditions and through legitimate claims of others in the scheme of things that there comes that truly wedded result which is able to stand shocks from whatever corner of the compass. Is not that result worth working for? Is it not worth some sacrifice, if some sacrifice must be its price?

The policy of His Majesty's Government, in respect of the future status of India, is clear beyond any question. But the achievement of a particular status carries with

(a) *The Daily Gazette*, Karachi, dated the 17th December, 1942.

(b) " " " " " " 18th " "

it heavy obligations. In the modern world, whether we like it or not, a readiness to accept heavy financial burdens, to accept liability for the defence on whatever scale our geographical position demands at whatever cost. (a)

But, if the end is to be achieved and maintained constant vigilance, constant effort and constant forethought will be needed, and that is relevant to what I have just said about the unity of India. A divided people cannot carry the weight that it ought to carry, or make its way in the world with the same confident expectations of success.

Great Britain's help will always be available and had been freely offered. In the time that I have been in this country one proposition after another has been advanced by His Majesty's Government and by myself in the hope of producing a generally acceptable solution. I myself can claim to have brought together Mr. Jinnah and Mahatma Gandhi though unhappily, without result. I have worked very hard, if unsuccessfully, to bridge the gulf between parties, interests and communities. You are familiar with the suggestions that the troubles of India are due to Britain's refusal to part with power. Exactly the contrary is the case. These troubles are due to Britain's expressed readiness to part with power. It is because an agreement cannot be reached between the conflicting interests in this country as to who is to take over the responsibilities, which Great Britain is only too ready to transfer to Indian hands, that the deadlock has arisen. It is not reluctance on the part of Government to transfer power.

It sometimes seems that our very endeavours to dissipate misconceptions and misunderstandings have tended to widen the gulf between those whom Government desire to unite rather than narrow it.

The mission of Sir Stafford Cripps to this country is the latest evidence of the anxiety of His Majesty's Government to see India self-governing under a scheme devised in full freedom by the principal elements in India's national life, of their readiness to leave this matter to a body composed of Indians themselves. To-day I see, with deep regret, little to encourage me to hope that the conflicting claims of the great parties and communities are likely in any degree to be abated. Yet I would like to feel that the problem is not beyond the genius of Indian leadership. Believe me when I say that, if in ten months' time or, so I can help to bridge these gulfs which I have spoken of, I shall leave a happy man."

and the MAHASABHA promptly "walked into the parlour" when at their annual session at Cawnpore they adopted the following resolution on

1942 31st December "In view of the fact that Britain is not prepared to part with power, as has been clearly proved by the rejection of the national demand formulated by the

Mahāsabha, and that Pakistan Muslims are actually threatening civil war, and particularly in view of the fact that the principle of Pakistan is being encouraged by the British Government as evidenced in the Cripps Scheme, this session of the Hindu Mahasabha has come definitely to conclusion that an active movement must be started to compel Britain to recognise India as an independent nation in the world, as well as to defend the integrity of India against the Pakistan Muslims.

To devise ways and means for mobilising the resources of the Hindus to cope with external aggression and national disorder and to prepare the Hindu forces to fight out this struggle efficiently, this session authorises the Working Committee to formulate a plan before April 30, 1943, with a view to that end."

In moving the resolution Dr. Moonje observed, *inter alia*, that the Mahasabha under no circumstances agree to any Pakistan Scheme to vivisect India.

Raja Maheshwar Dayal Seth said '.....the time had come when they should take the next step and resort to direct action to bring pressure on the bureaucracy to declare India free and withdraw the Cripps proposals which indirectly granted Pakistan to the Muslims.' (a)

The Moral is obvious

The Caravan of India moved on. Shree Chhatrapati Raja Gopala Acharya, ex-Premier of Madras, and the Mahatma's Deputy outside the jail, after seeing Mr. Jinnah, declared he felt hopeful of a settlement, and sought permission to see the Mahatma in jail, but the permission was refused. The permission was also denied in similar circumstances to the Working President of the Hindu Mahasabha. The bus was definitely missed: all attempts at overtaking it proved fruitless: and the British Government seemed to manifest no anxiety to lend a helping hand.!

THE CARAVAN MOVED ON. But, while caravans normally move on to a destination, the Indian Caravan moved on but with no set destination to reach: aimlessly did it drift in the desert expanses with guides who, through vision blurred with communalism, were unable to see their way on or out, and with no guiding stars visible in the Indian firmament.

THE CARAVAN DRIFTED and with it persisted the state of **FRUSTRATION.**

1943 March The state of the Muslim mind can be gathered from the following extracts from the speeches of prominent League Members of the Central Legislative Assembly during the debate on the Finance Bill: also from the resolutions and speeches at the annual sessions of the Muslim League and the Momin Conference at New Delhi:—

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan, outlining the Muslim League attitude towards the Finance Bill, said that in view of the attitude of Government and the blunders committed by them, the Muslim League Party had no choice but to vote against the Finance Bill. It seemed to him that the Government thought that they could carry on without any

(a) The *Statesman*, Delhi, dated the 2nd January 1943.

respect for public opinion. Government would not receive any help or assistance unless and until they radically changed this attitude.

Regarding the political problem he wanted the British Government to trust the country minus the Congress—if Congress could not be trusted—and hand over power to other interests. “If you have not won the confidence of the Congress party, have you won the confidence of any other party? Your past actions have been such that we cannot accept words *in toto* that our freedom would be assured after the war.” There should be a clear unequivocal declaration immediately of India’s freedom so that she could fight the war, as one of the United Nations, not fight it as a subordinate country but fight for her own freedom, and the freedom of other countries. He also urged an agreement among the various political parties in the country in order to defeat the British assertion that there was no agreement here. (a)

An emphatic demand for the immediate transfer of power to Indian hands was made by Nawabzada Liaqatali Khan, Deputy Leader of the Muslim League Party, who asserted that the present Government of India was completely divorced from the public opinion and did not enjoy the confidence of the people. He said: “It is most unfortunate that although every other country which was involved in this war was making an all-out effort, in India alone Government and the people are total strangers. It is, therefore, natural that the Indian Government, not enjoying the confidence of the people, should have its actions looked upon with suspicion.”

The Nawabzada explained that ‘Indianisation without popularisation’ was like changing a gramophone without changing the records. Criticism of the present Government would continue until real power was transferred to the representatives of the people.

“If you want the people to be with you, you must take into your confidence at least those parties which are willing to co-operate with you.” The Nawabzada claimed that the assertion that Britain’s readiness to transfer power had started trouble in the country did not hold water. On the other hand, their demand that the parties must come together and be united was an excuse for not transferring power.

In this connection he referred to the Home Member’s speech in which he had declared that the Congress—a party of rebels—had forfeited the rights of citizenship. The Government’s demand for unity amounted to the Muslim League going and negotiating with the Congress which, according to Government, had forfeited the right of citizenship. This alone would show, he said, that there

was no willingness on the part of the Government to part with the power.

The first reading of the Finance Bill was passed on 17th March, 1943, by 48 votes against 21. Hindu Mahasabha members voted for the Bill: Muslim League against, its spokesman asserting that Government were neither serious nor sincere regarding the transfer of power to Indian hands. (a)

1943 April *Extract from the presidential address of Mr. Jinnah at the 30th session of the All-India Muslim League held at Delhi on the 24th April, 1943:—(b)*

“The Muslim League had been accused of not helping the war effort. I say that so far as Muslim India is concerned, our cup of bitterness is nearly full, I once more draw the British Government’s attention to this. It is a very serious situation indeed, and the British Government ought to be kept informed. I inform them from this platform that the bitterness and disappointment at the shabby treatment meted out to Muslim India is a danger to them (cheers). Therefore, reconsider your position. Guarantee the Muslim right of self-determination and give a pledge to abide by the plebiscite of Mussalmans for Pakistan.

It was thoroughly dishonest on the part of the British Government to say that the League were non-co-operating. The Muslim League said that it could not co-operate. ‘You want me to come as a camp follower. What are the prospects for me? If I am defeated, Japan or Hitler will come. If I win, I am to be a camp follower and get a baksheesh. Is this an incentive to co-operation? Can any honourable, respectable nation accept that position? (cries of ‘no’). Therefore, really they have blundered and are blundering or do not want to part with power and are taking their chance, as a gambler does, saying to themselves, ‘if we win, we will keep them where they are. If we lose, then after us the deluge.’

Dwelling on the nature of the constitution under Pakistan, Mr. Jinnah said that it would be a constitution which would be framed by the ‘millat’ and the people: ‘Perhaps you yourselves will see that you make a constitution which is after your hearts’ desire,’ he exhorted his audience. The only question was about the minorities. Minorities, he said, were entitled to get definite assurances. Those assurances were part of the Lahore resolution. The whole history of Islam, the holy book of the Prophet, and the policy followed by the Muslim Governments were the clearest proof that non-Muslims had been treated not only justly and fairly but generously.

(a) The *Daily Gazette*, Karachi dated 18th March, 1943.

(b) „ „ „ „ 25th April, 1943.

Mr. Jinnah said: 'The British say that in resisting the Congress they are protecting us. We say, 'nothing of the kind. We don't believe that you love us so much.'

We know it suits them and they are taking the fullest advantage of the situation, because if there is any agreement between Hindus and Muslims, then they know the net result of that would be parting with power. 'If we cannot secure power as a United India, then let us take it as divided India. (cheers).'

"The British," said Mr. Jinnah, "knew full well that Hindus and Muslims would not agree, and if by some means or other they could agree, then it would be nothing but a cock-pit of feud under the umbrella of a united India with the Englishman on top. Lord Lingthgow and Mr. Amery, who were pucca die-hard brand, were dangling the carrot before the donkey by saying that geographically India was one and that under Akbar India was united. If by any miracle Hindus and Muslims came to an agreed constitution on the basis of a united India, it could only be done for British India, and then the biggest hurdle would be Indian States. There were a series of hurdles."

"This", said Mr. Jinnah, "is the policy of the British Government pursued for a hundred years. Not only have they some how or other made us miss the bus, but put us on the wrong bus" (cheers).

"I say to the Hindus—and the British know it—the quickest way for the freedom of the people of India, both Hindus and Muslims, is Pakistan, (cheers), whether it comes in my lifetime or not (cries 'it will'). I can say this with a clear conscience. My regret is that it is the Congress and Hindu leadership that is holding up the attainment of freedom for both Hindus and Muslims."

After charging Mr. Gandhi and other Congress leaders with systematic and deliberate attempt to establish Hindu rule in India, Mr. Jinnah said: "Let us close that chapter. Even nations that have killed millions of each other—we have not done so yet—even they who were the bitterest enemies yesterday have today become friends. That is politics. I make this appeal to the Hindu public. If your leaders are on this path, as I say they are, and if you do not approve of it, it is your responsibility, the responsibility of the Hindu public, to come forward and say, 'stop this internecine war. Declare a truce. Let us sit as two equals and come to a settlement.' That is now the problem of problems. I ask how can you keep on saying that it is the British that keep us apart? Of course, I grant that the British take advantage of our folly. But we have devices of our own, which are better than any devices that the British Government can fashion to keep us disunited (cheers). Why should not the country say 'unite and drive the British out?' It is no use appealing to other nations of the world."

Deprecating talk of some sort of loose federation, Mr. Jinnah declared, "there is no such thing as a loose federation. When a Central Federal Government is established, it will tighten and tighten until the units are pulverised in the matter of real power and are reduced to the same status as Indian States at present."

"We are opposed to any such scheme. It is bound in the long run to lead to certain emasculation of the entire Muslim nation, socially, educationally, culturally, economically and politically, and to the establishment of a Hindu majority Raj in this sub-continent. Therefore, dismiss from your mind any idea of this kind that might lure you."

Mr. Jinnah declared, "Nobody will welcome it more than myself if Mr. Gandhi is now really willing to come to a settlement with the Muslim League, *on the basis of Pakistan.* Let me tell you that will be the greatest day both for Hindus and Muslims. If that is Mr. Gandhi's desire, what is there to prevent him from writing direct to me? (cheers). Who is there that can prevent him from doing so? (renewed cheers). What is the use of going to the Viceroy? Strong as this Government may be in this country, I cannot believe that they will have the daring to stop such a letter if it is sent to me, (more cheers). It will be a very serious thing indeed if such a letter were stopped."

Mr. Jinnah proceeded "Mr. Gandhi gets all the information and knows what is going on. If there is any change of heart on his part, he has only to drop a few lines to me. Then the Muslim League will not fail, whatever may have been our controversy before" (hear, hear and cheers).

The following resolution was adopted at the 30th session of the All-India Muslim League held at New Delhi on the 26th April 1943 :—

This session of the All-India Muslim League views with concern and grave apprehension the failure of the British Government to make an explicit declaration asked for in the resolution passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League in Bombay on August 20th 1942.

Since that resolution was passed, the speeches and statements made by responsible British statesmen, both in England and in India, lead to the conviction that not only the declaration such as was asked for will not be forthcoming, but that some kind of federal constitution, not necessarily on the model embodied in the Act of 1935, is under contemplation. This session, therefore, warns the British Government in all earnestness that the imposition of such a federal constitution will be resisted by Muslim

— These words occurred in the text of the Address as published.

India with all its might, which will inevitably result in strife, bloodshed and misery, the responsibility of which will rest on the British Government alone.

This session of the All India Muslim League is convinced that the attainment of the cherished goal of Pakistan is only possible by the untiring effort, willing sacrifices and grim determination of the Muslims, and they should therefore do their utmost to acquire the strength requisite for such an undertaking."

(The Bombay Resolution of August 20, 1942, *inter alia* demanded of the British Government an unequivocal declaration without delay guaranteeing to the Mussalmans the right of self-determination, and to pledge themselves that they would abide by the verdict of a plebiscite of Mussalmans and give effect to the Pakistan scheme in consonance with the basic principles laid down by the Lahore resolution of the All-India Muslim League passed in March 1940.

By the Bombay resolution the League also expressed itself ready and willing to consider any proposals and negotiate with any party on a footing of equality for the setting up of a provisional Government of India in order to mobilise the resources of the country for the purpose of the defence of India and successful prosecution of the war, provided the demands of Muslim India as indicated above were conceded unequivocally) (a).

1943 April Presiding over the annual session of the Provincial MAJLIS-I-AHRAR, U. P., held at Saharanpur on the 27th April Maulana Ghulam Ghaus declared that the COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE OF INDIA was the goal of the Majlis and it was prepared to co-operate with any other party whose object was the same as that of the Ahrars.

Speaking about Pakistan the President said that if the Hindus tried to establish Hindu Raj in India, then the Muslims would be compelled to establish Muslim Raj which they would achieve with unity and strength. The Ahrars, he continued, were eager to live in co-operation with other communities, as their ideal was the equality of man, but they were not prepared to relinquish their rights, nor would they deprive others of their legitimate rights.

Explaining the difference between the policy of the Muslim League and that of his party the President said that the Muslim League's aim was 'to divide first and then take,' while the Ahrars' principle was 'to take first and then divide.'

Criticising the Congress policy, he asked if the Congress was anxious to settle amicably the question of Muslim rights, why did Mahatma Gandhi hesitate to

approach other Muslim organisations in the country when Mr. Jinnah had refused to negotiate? That was one of the reasons, added the President, why Ahrars did not follow the Congress programme. (a)

1943 April

Presiding over the eighth annual session of the All India MOMINS Conference held at New Delhi on the 28th April Mr. Zahir-ud-din in his address, *inter alia*, refuted the claim of the Muslim League to represent the entire Muslim community. He called it 'wrong,' 'mischievous' and 'misleading.' He claimed that four and a half crores of Momins were definitely not with the Muslim League and their Pakistan scheme.

Speaking against the Pakistan scheme, Mr. Zahir-ud-din said "If Pakistan is attained by the Muslim League, it will prove detrimental to the interests of the Mussalmans. The Muslim minorities in Hindu India will become like the Moplahs and Hurs, and I am confident that Pakistan will not come to the aid of the Muslims in minority provinces." (b)

Momins to Join the League !

According to an Associated Press message from New Delhi dated the 28th April, Sheikh Zahir-ud-din, President of the All-India Momin Conference, in a press interview said that he had written to Mr. Jinnah that if the Muslim League took up the cause of the poor and backward classes among Muslims, he would be prepared to join the Muslim League. He had received no reply.

Replying to questions he said that the Momin Conference had enjoined upon their members not to join the Muslim League or the Congress because they wanted to organise their people in their own way. They were anxious to show to the world that they were not under the influence of either the Muslim League or the Congress.

He added that the Momins were prepared to work with any organisation struggling for the freedom of the country because that would alone bring about amelioration of the condition of the poorer and backward classes like Momins. Pakistan or Akhand Hindustan would not solve their problem of bread. (c)

1943 May Mr. AMERY REPLIES !

London, May 6—Asked in the House of Commons if in view of the recent events in India he would take an opportunity to bring all parties there into negotiations with His Majesty's Government, Mr. Amery replied: "I regret to say there have not been any recent developments that would hold out a prospect of such negotiations leading to any fruitful results."

(a) The *Daily Gazette*, Karachi, dated the 28th April, 1943.

(b) " " " " " " " " " "

(c) " " " " " " 29th " " "

Asked if in view of the gravity of the issues involved, the time had not been reached when the Government of India might take a more constructive line, Mr. Amery replied : "I am considering these problems all the time." (a)

Bombay, May 9—Addressing a mass meeting held under the auspices of the ALL INDIA SCHEDULED CLASSES FEDERATION, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, appealing to the Scheduled Class people to join the All India Scheduled Class Federation, said that, placed as they were, they had to organise themselves to protect their own interests. They should prepare themselves to fight their battle for political rights when the new constitution of India was drafted. "The stand we take", he said, "is that the constitution must be tripartite". It must be a constitution which will be controlled and worked by free, independent and important elements in the national life of the country. We do not propose to allow Hindus and Muslims to work up an arrangement for political advancement leaving the Scheduled Class in the cold. Therefore, we propose to have one single organisation such as the All India Scheduled Class Federation functioning all over India and acting as a single live piece to this particular political aspiration of the Depressed Classes." (b)

New Delhi, May 10—The Working Committee of the ALL INDIA HINDU MAHASABHA in a resolution declared that Mr. Jinnah's invitation to Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress to write to him is suggestive of expectation of a favourable response "from quarters ready to agree to a cent percent transfer of power to the League". The Hindu Mahasabha realises that under the circumstances they may have to meet and fight the danger of Pakistan single-handed and urges upon all Hindu brethren to prepare and be ready for the same. One of the remedies is to elect none but a sworn Hindu to all representative bodies.

The resolution also declared that such violent language as had been used recently from the Muslim League platform lends itself to the interpretation of being a direct challenge to both the traditional patience and bravery of the Hindus. (c)

1943 May 26—*The following communique was issued by the Government of India:—*

"The Government of India have received a request from Mr. Gandhi to forward a short letter from himself to Mr. Jinnah expressing a wish to meet him. In accordance with their known policy in regard to correspondence or interviews with Mr. Gandhi, the Government of India have decided that this letter cannot be forwarded and have so informed Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah. They are not prepared to give facilities for political correspondence or

(a) The Daily Gazette, Karachi, dated the 7th May 1943.

(b) " " " " " 10th " "

(c) " " " " " 11th " "

contact to a person detained for promoting an illegal mass movement which he has not disavowed and thus gravely embarrassing India's war effort at a critical time.

It rests with Mr. Gandhi to satisfy the Government of India that he can safely be allowed once more to participate in the public affairs of the country and until he does so the disabilities from which he suffers are of his own choice." (a)

May 28—*In a statement commenting on the above Delhi communique, dated Bombay May 28th, Mr. Jinnah said:—*

"This letter of Mr. Gandhi can only be construed as a move on his part to embroil the Muslim League to come into clash with the British Government solely for the purpose of helping his release, so that he would be free to do what he pleases thereafter. There is really no change of policy on the part of Mr. Gandhi and no genuine desire to meet the suggestions that I made in my speech during the sessions of the All India Muslim League at Delhi. Although I have always been ready and willing to meet Mr. Gandhi or any other Hindu Leader, and shall be still glad to meet him, yet merely expressing his desire to meet me is not the kind of ephemeral letter that. I suggested in my speech that Mr. Gandhi should write, and which has been now stopped by the Government. I have received a communication from the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, dated May 24, that Mr. Gandhi's letter merely expresses a wish to meet me and this letter, Government have decided, cannot be forwarded to me.

My speech was directed to meet the appeals that were made to me, and are now being made, by Hindu leaders, that the Muslim League should do something towards the solution of the deadlock, and my suggestions about the kind of letter that Mr. Gandhi should write were in response to those appeals, when I said that I myself saw no change of heart. There was no evidence of any change of policy on the part of Mr. Gandhi or Hindu leadership, and I referred to the recent correspondence that had passed between Mr. Gandhi and the Viceroy which, on the contrary, showed that Mr. Gandhi fully maintained his stand of August 6, 1942.

But nevertheless some of the responsible Hindu leaders pressed upon me that Mr. Gandhi has now realised that he has made a mistake, and that he would be prepared to reconsider and retrace his steps if he were given an opportunity to do so, and that he has changed his attitude towards Pakistan and would be willing to come to a settlement on the basis of Pakistan, but the British Government are preventing the Hindu Muslim settlement by refusing people of position and standing to establish contact with him for the purpose. I therefore suggested

that if Mr. Gandhi were to write to me a letter indicating that he was prepared to retrace his steps and abandon his policy and programme culminating in the resolution of the A. I. C. C. of August 8, and was even now willing to come to a settlement with the Muslim League on the basis of Pakistan, we were willing to bury the past and forget it. I still believe that the Government will not dare to sto p such a letter if it came from Mr. Gandhi." (a)

Mr. Jinnah, informs the British Government of the bitterness and disappointment at the shabby treatment meted out to Muslim India.' Mr. Amery seems to see no occasion for a change in the 'treatment.' Mr. Jinnah called for a letter from the Mahatma declaring a change of heart. The Mahatma sent out a letter to Mr. Jinnah (which was stopped by the Government), but Mr. Jinnah considered it was not what he wanted. The Mahasabha interprets Mr. Jinnah's invitation to the Mahatma as implying anticipation of Congress agreement in the Pakistan demand, and calls upon the Hindus to prepare for the fight. Mr. Jinnah appealed to the Hindu public to come forward and call for a truce. The appeal appears to have evoked no response.

Portents!

1943 June 20 THE MUSLIM MAJLIS—

Shams-ul Ulema Kamaluddin Ahmad, M. L. A. (Central), in a statement to the 'United Press' said;

'I welcome the very timely formation of the Muslim Majlis which is evidently an outcome of Mr. Jinnah's impossible attitude. Everywhere in the country I find a sense of exasperation as well as of frustration among the right-thinking Muslims who feel that the present policy of the Muslim League Leader is most disappointing. Mr. Jinnah has never defined his Pakistan, nor is he ever likely to do so, for as soon as he attempts this, the bubble will burst. We Muslims shall refuse to be any longer the laughing stock of the world including the great neighbouring countries of China, Russia, Iran, Afghanistan, Turkey, and Egypt, because of our failure to settle the communal problem which is being daily and deliberately complicated by a futile and opportunistic leadership—a leadership which in its unimaginative folly is sowing the seed of disaster for the future, especially for the Muslims. It is high time that the Muslims realised the grave danger that faces them and organised an opposition to any partition scheme of India, for Muslims are bound to suffer most in a divided India." (b)

June 30 *Khan Bahadur Shaikh Muhammad Jan, M. L. C., President, Muslim Majlis, issued the following statement:—*

'I have received numerous letters from Muslim enthusiasts throughout India asking for further elucidation of the ultimate goal of this new organisation. The object is nothing more and nothing less than the realisation of

(a) *The Daily Gazette*, Karachi dated the 29th May 1943.

(b) " " " " " 22nd June "

Independence for United India economically and politically by all constitutional means with full protection for Muslim rights and privileges and as a pre-requisite to resolving the present deadlock satisfactorily and honourably. Some prominent Muslim Leaguers have urged the Muslim Majlis to induce Hindus to evolve a generous policy thereby removing distrust and suspicion. My humble submission to my friends is to refuse the dictatorship of Mr. Jinnah and there will be no difficulty in effecting an honourable settlement between the two communities. As regards the desire expressed by many friends for holding an All India Conference I may state that I am communicating with many Muslim leaders on the subject' (a)

1943 August 2 *The following appeared in a manifesto issued by the Muslim Majlis explaining the basic and fundamental principles on which the Majlis has been established :*

"It is to foster the cause of the essential unity of India that the Muslim Majlis has come into being after mature deliberation by the Mussalmans. The Majlis has the interests of the Muslim community at heart. We have joined our hands under the banner of the Muslim Majlis to declare unequivocally that we will ultimately succeed in the cause we have espoused, both for national and communal good. It is the cause of national regeneration.. ..The present all-round frustration of our national and economic life points out clearly the inter-dependence of the Hindu Muslim problems which have been made vexatious and almost insurmountable by political opportunists in India. The attempt to create a geographical barrier has been a gigantic political blunder on the part of the propounders of that scheme. While the whole world is improving upon the most advanced ideas of political solidarity, enslaved India is being compelled to commit suicide in the name of Pakistan. Mr. Jinnah is one of those leaders who have blocked the way to the goal of freedom and national unity. His reactionary leadership is a powerful weapon in the hands of the British Government to resist the national aspirations of 400 million Indians. We must make an end of this reactionary leadership to save our community from its baneful effects. The community should be trained and disciplined in such a way that it may get all its political, economic, social and religious rights, on the one hand, and, on the other, it may work jointly with other communities for the attainment of the country's freedom." (b)

In the same manifesto the following have been declared to be the AIMS and OBJECTS of the MUSLIM MAJLIS:---

1. To achieve complete Independence for India politically and economically, in which every province shall enjoy full freedom, subject to the control by the

(a) The Daily Gazette, Karachi, 1st July, 1943.

(b) " " " " 3rd August "

Centre, in conformity with the powers assigned to it by the Provinces for the common good of India, so that each and every Community may get ample scope and opportunity for self-development in respect of cultural, educational, social and religious life, free from outside influence and interference, and also to prevent the legislatures from enacting any measure that may interfere with the religious functions and social customs of any Community.

2. To safeguard the rights and privileges of the Musalmans of India not only on the basis of their numerical strength but also according to special position of the Muslim Community and its importance in this Sub-Continent.

3. To oppose partition of India for it is not only detrimental to India's independence, but a constant source of strife and discord between the two major communities which may lead to civil war etc., which is against the best interests of the Mussalmans of India.

The April Conferences have come and gone. The Congress continues to be held behind prison bars. The Muslims continue to be left with their 'shabby treatment' on the one hand, with, on the other, no response to their gesture from the Congress and the Hindus. The Mahasabha 'sees red' in the League's gesture, feels Pakistan is looming on the horizon, and asks the Hindus to 'prepare for the fight'. A new claimant emerges in the field—the Scheduled Classes—claiming 'equal share' in the distribution of the spoils—'equal voice' with the Caste Hindus and the Muslims. The non-Party Leaders appear to have retired within themselves. While the Fighting India continues to fight, the Political India is left with her Deadlock and her Frustration!

THE DEADLOCK PERSISTS. FRUSTRATION HAS DEEPEINED.
THE CARAVAN CONTINUES TO DRIFT.

While this work has been passing through the press, time has passed by and the world has moved on. We are now in 1944, and, from indications, on the threshold of great events. In India, the only change has been the change in the occupant of the Viceregal gadi. While Fighting India continues to fight, Political India remains surrounded by its Vicious Circles. The new Viceroy has spoken—to say he is unable to say anything for the moment—an inevitable position for which none can blame him. The great All-India bodies, The Muslim League and The Hindu Mahasabha, have also spoken—to emphasise the futility of their respective stands!

20-12-1943—*At the Annual Sessions of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, H. E. VISCOUNT WAKEFIELD observed inter alia, (a)*

“I have attempted to review for you the progress of the war and the policy of the Government of India on our immediate economic problems; and to place before you some ideas on post-war reconstruction. I have said nothing of the constitutional or political problems of India, not because they are not constantly in my mind; not because I have not the fullest sympathy with the aspirations of India towards self-government; not because I consider political progress impossible during the course of the war—any more than I believe that the end of the war will by itself provide an immediate solution of the deadlock—but because I do not believe that I can make their solution any easier by talking about them just at present. For the time I must concentrate on the job of work we have to do. The winning of the war, the organisation of the economic home front, and the preparations for peace call for the use of all the resources India has in determination, energy, and intelligence. I welcome co-operation from anyone and anybody, who can assist me in these great problems on which the future of India depends. While I do not believe that political differences can be solved by administrative action, I believe that if we can co-operate now in the achievement of the great administrative aims, which should be common to all parties when the country is in peril, we shall do much to produce conditions in which the solution of the political deadlock will be possible. As head of the Government—and an old and sincere friend of India—I will do my best during my term of office to guide India on her path to a better future. It is no easy path, there are no short cuts, but I do believe in the future greatness that lies ahead, if we can work together, to the solution of our problems.”

25-12-1943—*The following is the main resolution adopted by the 31st Sessions of THE ALL-INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE at Karachi, appointing a COMMITTEE OF ACTION:—(b)*

“Whereas the All-India Muslim League in its annual session held at Delhi in April, 1943, had, in view of the vague, indefinite and unsettled policy of the British Government towards the Muslim demand of Pakistan on the one hand and the unpatriotic, short-sighted and antagonistic attitude of the

(a) The Daily Gazette, Karachi, dated the 21st December 1943.

(b) " " " " " " 26th " "

Hindus on the other, resolved to rely on the untiring efforts, grim determination and willing sacrifices of the Muslims of India generally and the Muslims of Pakistan zones in particular for the attainment of their cherished goal, this session of the All-India Muslim League hereby resolves to appoint a committee of action of not less than five and not more than seven members to be nominated by the President to prepare and organize the Muslims all over India to meet all contingencies, resist the imposition of an all-India federation or any other constitution for one united India, and prepare them for the coming struggle for the achievement of Pakistan."

23-12-1943—*The Silver Jubilee Sessions of THE ALL-INDIA HINDU MAHASABHA held at Amritsar adopted the following as the main resolution:—(a)*

"That in view of the deplorable political situation prevailing in the country and in view of the deepening sense of frustration paralysing the national will, the Conference expresses its deep resentment at the attitude adopted by the British Government inasmuch as they have not yet responded to the national demand for the immediate declaration of India's independence and of the immediate formation of a national Government.

The Conference records its opinion that the latest speech delivered at Calcutta by Lord Wavell, Viceroy of India, is profoundly disappointing and in the interest of the effective defence of India and economic rehabilitation of country, it is essential (a) that Mr. Amery should be removed from the position of the Secretary of State for India, (b) that the political deadlock should be ended, (c) that all the political prisoners, detenus should be released forthwith and (d) that negotiations be started for co-ordinating all nationalist elements in the country and for mobilising the resources of India for national defence.

"This Conference reaffirms its adherence to the principle preserving the integrity of India and urges the introduction of federation in the future constitution of India with a strong centre. It demands that no freedom should be accorded to the provinces or to any community or section to secede from the Indian federation. It also demands that representative assemblies both in the centre and provincial spheres should be constituted on the principles of joint electorate and one man one vote.

The Hindu Mahasabha reiterates the assurances given to the minorities that their religion and culture shall be adequately protected."

By another resolution the Mahasabha appointed a Committee to investigate Hindu grievances alleging unjust and oppressive treatment of Hindus by the Muslim Governments of Muslim Majority Provinces.

5th JANUARY, 1944.—*In an interview to the Associated Press at Karachi MR. JINNAH is reported to have observed :— (a)*

“The crux of the conferences of the Hindu Mahasabha and the Liberal Federation at Amritsar and Bombay and the attitude of Mr. Gandhi and the Congressmen clearly show that there is no change on the part of the Hindus towards the demand of Muslim India.

“Mr. Gandhi, as I pointed out in my address at the Karachi session of the Muslim League, on the authority of his letter to the Viceroy dated January 19, 1943, was not prepared to budge an inch from the August resolution and since then there is no indication of any change from Mr. Gandhi or by the Congressmen outside. The Hindu Mahasabha has gone one better at Amritsar and has clearly shown that they are for the establishment of a Vedic Hindu government over this entire sub-continent.

“And the Liberals have, as usual, passed a vague resolution advising all and sundry as to what they should do without making any concrete proposals of their own. But the main object underlying these conferences was to shelve the demand of Pakistan somehow. That is the result, and all the Hindu organisations have got one aim and objective as against Muslim India, namely, how they can torpedo Pakistan and jam in some system of Government immediately which will so tie up and tie down the Muslims as to make it impossible for them later on to press the Pakistan issue.

“All these efforts, in my view, are futile. Muslim India and the Muslim League have made up their mind definitely and can only proceed on the basis of Pakistan being agreed upon and there can be no compromise on the question of partition and division of India.

“After that question is settled, the Muslim League would be ready and willing to consider any proposal on honourable terms to set up an interim provisional composite government for the duration of the war and we shall be ready to give and make our best contribution for that purpose.”

Asked to define or redefine the basis of such a partition Mr. Jinnah said that he had already done so in his presidential speeches at the Muslim League sessions times out of number, and added: “I mean partition in terms of the Lahore resolution of 1940 that the provinces in which the Muslims are in a majority should form themselves into an independent state and in the rest of India—which is 3/4th—the provinces would be at liberty to form themselves into an independent state, so that there will be two independent states, Pakistan and Hindustan.

"Naturally, Pakistan will have its units as may be determined upon by the Muslims and Hindustan will have its units as may be determined upon by the Hindus."

Asked whether he would now take the initiative to make a settlement possible, Mr. Jinnah said :

"But with whom am I to negotiate ? I must have some one who represents the Hindus with whom I can negotiate. But the political aims of various Hindu organisations are different and they do not agree amongst themselves, and so far as the British are concerned, they are quite indifferent."

Our DEADLOCK and FRUSTRATION continue to persist! Our CARAVAN continues to drift!

Since the foregoing utterances were recorded, further notable pronouncements have been made. The Viceroy has spoken again: and Mr. Jinnah has allowed us further insight into his conception of Pakistan. These pronouncements are included herein so as to bring our record of events up-to-date.

17-2-1944—"NO MAN CAN ALTER GEOGRAPHY"—*Viscount Wavell*. (a)

".... It is more difficult at present to plan India's political future in any detail. I can state to you what I know is the point of view of practically the whole of the British people, of His Majesty's present Government, and I am confident, of any future Government of the United Kingdom. It is their genuine desire to see India a prosperous country, a united country, enjoying complete and unqualified self-government as a willing partner of the British Commonwealth. That last desire is not prompted by any sense of imperialism or wish for domination but by a real belief that in such association India can best find security and help in the testing years ahead, and that peace in the East can so be best assured.

I am absolutely convinced not only that the above represents the genuine desire of the British people, but that they wish to see an early realisation of it. It is qualified only at present by an absolute determination to let nothing stand in the way of the earliest possible defeat of Germany and Japan; and by a resolve to see that in the solution of the constitutional problem full account is taken of the interest of those who have loyally supported us in this war and at all other times—the soldiers who have served the common cause, the people who have worked with us; the rulers and populations of the States to whom we are pledged; the minorities who have trusted us to see that they get a fair deal. We are bound in justice, in honour, in the interest of progress, to hand over India to Indian rule, which can maintain the peace and order and progress which we have endeavoured to establish. I believe that we should take some risk to further this; but until the two main Indian parties at least can come to terms, I do not see any immediate hope of progress.

The Cripps offer was a bold and generous offer and gave India a great opportunity to progress towards solution of her problem. Be well assured that it was not made in any panic. I can say that with certainty; I was Commander-in-Chief at the time and in a position to know that there was no panic in the councils of those in authority, either in India or in the United Kingdom. We are not a people who panic easily in the face of danger. The offer was made in the hope that the war had come so close to India and threatened its national life, that it might arouse, as in other countries, a spirit of unity and co-operation that would have overridden political differences in the hour of danger. That hope was not fulfilled. There is no profit in recriminations about the reasons for the rejection of the Cripps offer.

But since that offer, as has been stated more than once by His Majesty's Government, is still open, it may be well to

(a) Extract from the Viceroy's address to a Joint Sessions of the Legislature—*The Daily Gazette*, Karachi, dated the 18th February 1944.

restate it here. Nearly two years have passed since the Cripps draft declaration was made public, but it stands forth today as the solemn pledge of His Majesty's Government that India shall have full control of her own destiny among the nations of the Commonwealth and of the world. It declared in unmistakable terms that India should have the same status as the dominions or the United Kingdom itself under the constitution of her own devising. It also embodied a constructive suggestion by His Majesty's Government to aid India in the attainment of that status.

Proposals were made for setting up a constitution-making body, representative, both of British India and of the Indian States; and His Majesty's Government undertook to accept and implement the constitution framed by this body, subject to two conditions. First, the declaration recognised the right of a province not to accede to the Indian Union. Such provinces could either retain their present constitutional position; or, if they so desired, His Majesty's Government would agree with them upon a new constitution giving them the same status as the new Indian Union itself. Second, the declaration made provision for the signing of a treaty between His Majesty's Government and the constitution-making body to provide for matters arising out of the transfer of power, including protection for racial and religious minorities. It was made clear beyond all doubt that this treaty would not impose any restrictions upon the power of the Indian Union to decide in the future its relationship with the other States of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The Cripps offer was an offer to India of full self-government, of the right to frame her own constitution, and even of the right, if she so desired, to sever her partnership with the British Commonwealth. Because of the military situation—which still obtains—it was provided that pending the framing of the future constitution, the direction of defence should remain the responsibility of His Majesty's Government, but it was contemplated that Indian leaders should be associated not only with the Government of their country under the existing constitution necessarily, till a new constitution was framed and accepted—but with the counsels of the Commonwealth and of the United Nations.

The offer of co-operation in the Government on this basis by the leaders of Indian opinion is still open, to those who have a genuine desire to further the prosecution of the war and the welfare of India, but the demand for release of those leaders who are in detention is an utterly barren one until there is some sign on their part of willingness to co-operate. It needs no consultation with any one or anything but his own conscience for any one of those under detention to decide whether he will withdraw from the Quit India resolution and the policy which had such tragic consequences, and will co-operate in the great tasks ahead.

Not the least of those tasks is the preliminary examination of the constitutional problems of India by an authoritative body of Indians. We should be ready to give this body every

assistance it might desire in carrying out its task. For the present the Government of the country must continue to be a joint British and Indian affair—with the ultimate responsibility still remaining with the British Parliament, though it is exercised through a predominantly Indian executive—until it can be transferred to a fresh constitution. But the framing of that future constitution is essentially and properly an Indian responsibility. Until they can agree on its form, the transfer of power cannot be made. We offered a suggestion in the Cripps proposals, which may or may not have been suitable. If Indians can devise a method which will produce agreement more readily, so much the better. If I may offer a personal opinion, born of some experience, the smaller the body which discusses a difficult and controversial problem, the more likely it is that a profitable solution will emerge.

On the main problem of Indian unity, the difference between Hindu and Muslim, I can only say this. You cannot alter geography. From the point of view of defence, of relations with the outside world, of many internal and external economic problems, India is a natural unit. What arrangements you decide to make for two great communities and certain other important minorities, as well as the Indian States, to live within that unit and to make the best use of its wealth and opportunities is for Indians to decide. That two communities and even two nations can make arrangements to live together in spite of differing cultures or religions, history provides many examples. The solutions of the problems have varied. England and Scotland, after centuries of strife, arrived at an absolute union; in Canada, the British and French elements reached a federal agreement which operates satisfactorily; the French, Italian and German elements in Switzerland agreed on a different form of federation. In all the above there were religious as well as racial differences. In the United States many elements, racial and religious, have been fused into one great nation with a federal structure, after the bitter experience of a disastrous civil war.

In Ireland the conflicting elements have so far failed to unite, and Ireland has a sort of Pakistan, though the analogy is, of course, only relative. The Soviet Union in Russia seems to have devised a new modification of its already flexible system, which will also, no doubt, repay careful study.

These examples are before India for her constitutionalists to study. It is for her to say which will most nearly fulfil her own needs. But no man can alter geography.

I have spoken to you frankly and bluntly as I have been taught to speak, as a soldier. Let me re-state the main principles which guide me in my heavy task and responsibility. Our primary object, over-riding all others, must be not merely to make certain of winning the war—the United Nations have already done that, by endurance through adversities, by sacrifice of comforts, by unity of spirit, by unremitting hard work—but to win it as speedily as possible, and with the least draft on future prosperity. That is a great administrative task. The second task is to prepare for the future, economically and politically.

We cannot settle the future of this country without the full co-operation of the British and Indian peoples and the co-operation within the Indian people of Hindus, Muslims and other minority groups and of the Indian States.

I am conscious of the co-operation of many elements in this country—the eminent and patriotic Indians of my Executive Council and of provincial Governments; the fighting forces of India, the largest forces ever raised in history by voluntary enlistment; the leaders and workers of industry who have made such a contribution to the war; the rulers of the Indian States. All these place India first in their thoughts and aims, but they have a practical view of the necessity for co-operation to realise progress.

There is an important element which stands aloof; I recognise how much ability and high-mindedness it contains: but I deplore its present policy and methods as barren and unpractical. I should like to have the co-operation of this element in solving the present and the future problems of India. If its leaders feel that they cannot consent to take part in the present Government of India, they may still be able to assist in considering future problems. But I see no reason to release those responsible for the declaration of August 8 1942, until I am convinced that the policy of non-co-operation and even of obstruction has been withdrawn—not in sackcloth and ashes, that helps no one—but in recognition of a mistaken and unprofitable policy.....

I have no desire to make invidious comparisons but I do feel it worthwhile to point out that a coalition government by Indians for Indians is not an impossible ideal. It is being carried out at the centre without friction; it has been carried on for nearly seven years with conspicuous success in the Punjab. Thanks to the leadership of men of good sense, goodwill, and good courage, the affairs of that province have prospered with the minimum of communal friction; they have administered their province in the interests of the province, but also with regard to the interests of India and of the war effort of the United Nations, to which the Punjab has made so striking a contribution. I will make bold enough to say that had all provinces worked the 1935 Act in the same spirit and with the same efficiency, India would now be very close to complete self-Government.

We have come a long way together up the steep and difficult mountain at the summit of which lies complete Indian self-government. We are almost within sight of the top, but as with most mountain climbs that are worth doing, the final cliffs are the steepest and most baffling of all. At such a time it is doubly necessary to test each handhold and foothold, to cut adequate steps in slippery ice, so that the whole party, roped together, may not fall back in ruin. It is not the moment that prudent mountaineers choose to unrope, to dismiss their guides, and after the mildest dispute to take separate routes towards different peaks, we must go on together; we cannot halt too long at the heights which we have reached, and we cannot with honour or safety turn back,

We may have to pause to reconnoitre or cut steps, but we must endeavour to go on climbing, even though the rate may seem slow to impatient watchers or to the climbers themselves. Finally, we must keep in mind the splendour of the view that lies before us when the summit is reached—the prospect of an India at peace within herself, a partner in our great Commonwealth of Nations, the mother of a great people, a shield for peace in the East, busy and prosperous, yet with leisure to develop the thought and poetry and art which are the real salt of life and of which India has already contributed much to the world. Not an immediate vision, but I do not think it unattainable, if we work together with patience, good sense and goodwill.

I believe firmly in the future of India; I am a sincere friend of India and should like to help her to political advance, but my military training has made me quite certain that no objective is ever gained without the fullest measure of co-operation from all concerned.”—A. P.

29-2-1944—Mr. Jinnah on “THE WAY OUT”—(a)

“If little New foundland can stand on its own feet in the same continent as Canada, then Pakistan with its population of 70 to 80 millions is certainly strong enough to march alone,” declared Mr. Jinnah in an interview to a London paper.

“Government seem to be content with the present position and so far as any action is concerned, appear to be completely paralysed. The Congress is outlawed and shows no change of heart.”

Question: “Why should not Government open negotiations with the Congress or allow somebody like Mr. Rajagopalachari, who has agreed in principle to your demand for Pakistan—separate Muslim and Hindu States—to go and try and persuade Mr. Gandhi to change their attitude?”

Mr. Jinnah: “That means that unless Mr. Gandhi is persuaded, Government won’t meet our just demand for Pakistan. We cannot accept this position. So far as Government is concerned, I don’t know what their policy is in this matter, but if Government were to follow your suggestion, it would be an admission that the Congress has won and that Government cannot get on without the Congress.”

Question: “Well, what should be done?”

Mr. Jinnah: “If the British Government are sincere in their desire for peace in India, they should now frame a new constitution dividing India into two sovereign nations—Pakistan for Muslims, representing one-quarter of the country, and Hindustan for Hindus, who would have three-quarters of all India.”

Question: “But surely it is not a desirable thing to weaken India and lay her open to future aggression by dividing her into two countries.”

Mr. Jinnah: "I don't agree that India would be any safer under forced unity. In fact she might be more vulnerable, because Hindus and Muslims will never be reconciled with one another. Any agreement between Muslims and Hindus to work together as a single unit or even in a federation is an impossibility. Newfoundland has been promised complete independence. If little Newfoundland can stand on its own feet in the same continent as Canada, then Pakistan, with its population of 70,000,000 to 80,000,000, equal to twice the population of Great Britain, is certainly strong enough to march alone. Russia does not think it a source of weakness to divide herself into 16 autonomous states. Britain has for years tried to establish India as a united nation and all her efforts have failed. Now Britain must reconcile herself to the idea of an India consisting of two nations."

Question: "But you know that the Congress and Hindus will never accept that. If Government try to implement such a plan, the Congress and the Hindus would launch a civil disobedience campaign and there would be violence and possibly a civil war."

Mr. Jinnah: "On the contrary, nothing like that would happen. If the British Government announced their intention of setting up Pakistan and Hindustan, the Congress and the Hindus would accept it within three months. In other words, Government will have called the Congress bluff. In fact, the Pakistan principle is working smoothly already in the five predominantly Muslim provinces where Hindus are holding Cabinet office in Muslim League Governments. Pakistan would be in the interests of everybody. Certainly the Hindus would have no grievance under it because they would get three-fourths of India—territory larger and a population greater than any sovereign state with the exception of Soviet Russia and China."

Question: "But surely there would be a civil war. You would be creating an Indian Ulster which the Hindus might one day attack in the name of united India."

Mr. Jinnah: "I don't agree, but there would be under the new constitution a transitional period for settlement and adjustment during which time British authority, so far as armed forces and foreign affairs, would remain paramount. The length of the transitional period would depend on the speed with which the two peoples and Great Britain adjusted themselves to the new constitution."

Finally, the two Indian nations would enter into treaties with Britain just as Egypt did when she won her independence."

Question: "What if Britain then refused to leave India on the grounds that relations between Hindustan and Pakistan were not good enough to live as neighbours?"

Mr. Jinnah: "That might happen, but it is not likely. Even so we should enjoy a degree of autonomy which we do not possess today. As a separate nation and a Dominion we should at least be in a better position to deal with and possibly reach an agreement with the British Government, which we are not able to do during the present deadlock."

Question: "Do you believe that Britain is sincere when she says she wants to give India freedom as the earliest possible opportunity?"

Mr. Jinnah: "I will believe Britain's sincerity when she divides India and gives both the Muslims and Hindus freedom. As John Bright said in 1838 'but how long does England propose to govern India?. Does any man with the smallest glimmer of common sense believe that so great a country, with its 20 different nations and its 20 languages, can ever be bound up and consolidated into one compact and enduring Empire?"

Question: "Are you likely to see the Viceroy while you are in Delhi."

Mr. Jinnah: "If the Viceroy asks me to see him, I shall be very pleased, but I do not know what more I can say other than what I have already said."

4-3-1944—Dr. Latif on Mr. Jinnah's "WAY OUT" (a)

"Will Muslims at least now realise whither the President of the Muslim League is taking them?" says Dr. Syed Abdul Latif, commenting on Mr. Jinnah's interview to the *News Chronicle*.

"I knew from the beginning," continues Dr. Latif, "that Mr. Jinnah was never seriously after Pakistan. He now makes it clear he does not want his Pakistan, be it even a Dominion looking after its own defence and foreign affairs. He wants for it no better status than that of an Indian State without a prince, a mere protectorate at best, developing slowly through an indefinite period of transition into an Egypt, technically independent but dependent for its integrity on the goodwill of England. It is true he thundered from the League's platform at Karachi that the Briton must 'divide and quit.' He now explains he really meant him to 'divide and stay,' comfortably, both in Pakistan and Hindustan with all his armed forces, and look after their foreign relations as well. For his part, he says, he will be content with 'a degree of autonomy which we do not possess.' Such is Mr. Jinnah's patriotic vision of India's constitutional future. Will any Briton thank him for it? Even the rankest British reactionary will feel sadly amazed over such a mentality.

Britain has repeatedly expressed that the Cripps plan stands, offering India as a whole—and even seceding territorial areas—full freedom and equality of status with Britain soon after the war, and even the right of breaking from the Commonwealth. Instead of seizing the opportunity by coming to terms with the other parties in the land, Mr. Jinnah, on behalf of 'a freedom-loving people like the Muslims of India,' says 'No, thanks, we shall be happy as camp followers.' Will the rank and file of the Muslim League approve of this?"

—Associated Press.

10-3-1944—"CONCEDE PAKISTAN AND WIN THE WAR"—Jinnah. (a)

"The surest way to win the war, which His Excellency the Viceroy considers his first job, is to concede the Pakistan demand, which means freedom both for the Hindus and the Muslims," said Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the Muslim League, addressing the Aligarh University Union today. The British Government could thus prove their sincerity and *bona fides* that they want to transfer real self-government to the people of this vast sub-continent, he added, instead of throwing feelers to Mr. Gandhi and the Congress to guarantee their good behaviour and agree to the political issues being indefinitely shelved or put into cold storage.

Mr. Jinnah asserted that the division of India was inevitable and Pakistan a certainty. A blending of the two nations, the Hindus and the Muslims, was an impossibility, and it was futile and unwise now to obstruct or delay the establishment of Pakistan.

Characterising the Viceroy's address to the Central Legislature (in which reference was made to the geographical unity of India) as provocative and thoughtless of the Muslim position, Mr. Jinnah said that His Excellency was anxious to throw a bait to the Congress and Mr. Gandhi to secure their good behaviour during the war period. No doubt, Lord Wavell, like his predecessor, had started fishing in Congress waters, and hoped to succeed where his predecessor had failed in landing a big fish or a number of small ones sufficient for his purpose.

Mr. Jinnah said that Lord Wavell's conception of unity from the point of view of defence and internal and external economic problems could only be interpreted as a clear indication how best to maintain and continue British occupation and its imperialistic stranglehold over India. He had disregarded the demands of Muslim India and had taken undue advantage of the present policy of non-embarrassment of the Muslim League. The future bait to the Congress would lead India nowhere and in his opinion it was a dangerous game to play which might lead to very serious consequences.

Mr. Jinnah, speaking at a lunch given in his honour by Sir Ziauddin Ahmad, Vice-Chancellor of the Aligarh University, said: "Pakistan is not a product of the conduct or misconduct of the Hindus. It has always been there. Only they have been unconscious of it. Hindus and Muslims, though living in the same towns and villages, have never been blended into one nation. They have always been two separate entities."

Mr. Jinnah has been reminded of the "Geography" Circle! He has indicated his "WAY OUT", but the parties concerned have shown no inclination to follow it! Despite his vision of the "WAY OUT", the League Leader appears to be very much 'at sea', now sounding the shoals of 'Hindustan', now seeking a haven with Britain! January and February have also seen an attempt by Pundit Madan Mohan Malavia to convene an All-Parties Leaders' Conference, but the Conference has not materialised so far! Our Deadlock and Frustration continue to persist! Our Caravan continues to drift!

(a) The Times of India dated the 13th March 1944.

PART-III—THE COMMUNAL QUESTION

CHAPTER I

• • THE COMMUNITIES IN THE PAST

Communalism an Old Problem—the Verdict of History.

Extract from 'THE RISE AND FULFILMENT OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA' by Edward Thompson and G. T. Garratt, pages 623-625:—

“Communalism is an old Indian problem which time does little to solve. Only to a small extent is this enmity based on race or religion. It may be better regarded as the revolt of emancipated lower caste Indians against the social and financial domination of the higher castes. The Muslim invaders brought very few of their own countrymen into India, and it is only in the extreme north of the peninsula that Central Asian types are common. According to census reports hardly a sixth of the Muhammadans, even in the Punjab, are of a different race from the Hindus. The great bulk of Indian Muslims are descendants of converts, in nearly every case of converts from the lower caste Hindus. Many Hindu customs, and sometimes even the caste system, still survive amongst them, but their new religion gives them a self-respect and class consciousness which was denied to those who remained in the Hindu system. Recently the work of Dr. Ambedkar and others has had a similar effect upon the depressed classes amongst the Hindus.

Almost invariably there is some economic basis to Hindu and Muslim rivalry. In many parts the Hindus are the shopkeepers and money-lenders, the Muslims peasants. In cities the petty employers and shopkeepers may, be Hindu and their labourers chiefly Muslim. Sometimes, as in Bombay north-country Muslims have been brought in as strike-breakers. Where such rivalry exists, disturbances usually follow some religious provocation—the sacrificial killing of cows or the playing of music in front of mosques—but the underlying force is an economic grievance.

Of later years all religions and castes have found it expedient to organise politically, and they have also discovered that disturbances are an easy way of attracting the attention of the Government to any grievances. The worst trouble is likely to occur where communities are comparatively equal, and are anxious to display their strength. Recent political developments have added to this temptation, while doing nothing to ease the old economic differences. Perhaps the best evidence of the political nature of much communal trouble is to be found in the Indian States. Until the last decade they were almost free from this scourge. Under strictly autocratic rule no one is likely to gain from such demonstrations. It was useless for a Hindu Sabha or Muslim League to agitate against a Muslim or Hindu Prince. It was better to take thankfully what they could get, and the Prince could afford to be generous to his subjects of another religion. Now that some semblance of democracy has been introduced in most of the larger States, and the inhabitants have learnt that the Government of India may intervene in case of a well-advertised quarrel, Hindu-Muslim troubles have occurred in Kashmir, Alwar, and other States and these have been almost as serious as any in British India.

The 1919 scheme retained the communal electorates of the Morley-Minto reforms, for which neither political group could blame the Government. The Muslims specifically demanded separate electorates, and the Hindu leaders conceded the principle in the 'Lucknow Pact' of 1916. Their effect has been altogether bad. It is not only that they have led Indians to organise along sectarian lines, for this was probably inevitable, and caste grouping occurs even within the Hindu constituencies, but the system throws up the worst type of pugnacious fanatic, who loves to 'prove his doctrines orthodox, by apostolic blows and knocks'. The feeling that great changes were going to take place, and the prospect of some actual transfer of responsibility and control over appointments, have combined to rouse all the meaner political passions, especially in those Provinces, like Bengal and the Punjab, where the two communities are nearly equal in number. Middle-class unemployment, and a family system which elevates nepotism into something like a virtue, have also helped to embitter the politico-religious struggle. A further and very grave disadvantage of the communal electorate is that an alteration in the balance of the parties can only occur through wholesale proselytism or through differences in the birth-rate. And both sides are stirred to new missionary enterprise, when the reward is not only a soul but also a permanent addition to one's voting strength. The activities of the Arya Samaj amongst the poorer Muslims, and of various Muhammadan bodies amongst the lower caste Hindus, have caused the greatest bitterness. The politicians get all the support they need from an irresponsible Press, while ill-feeling amongst the educated classes is kept alive by scurrilities like the Rangila Rasul.

Towards the middle of the decade two other political developments tended to accentuate communal feeling. The movement to organise the depressed classes and outcastes was a severe blow, not only to the Brahmins, but also to certain wealthy but more lowly castes. It had added to the missionary fervour of both the Hindu and Muslim communities, for here are potential converts being snatched away into another fold. Less justifiable and far more dangerous is the revival of pan-Islamic ambitions amongst certain sections of educated Muhammadans. The emergence of Federation as a serious political proposition has given a new meaning to old and vague aspirations. The fear that the Central Government will be dominated by caste Hindus has revived the idea of a great northern Muslim country, including and possibly centring round Afghanistan, and having Karachi as a port. Propaganda of this kind added significance to the Kashmir troubles, where a Muslim State is profoundly discontented under a Hindu Prince. When Lord Irwin succeeded Lord Reading in 1926, communal tension due to these various factors, had become acute, and his arrival was heralded by fierce Hindu-Muslim rioting."

CHAPTER—II

THE COMMUNITIES IN THE PRESENT

Section (i)—SIMILARITIES BETWEEN HINDUS AND MUSLIMS

“Caste and creed forbade inter-marriage, but there were classes to which Hindus and Musalmans alike belonged—classes of peasants, landlords, traders, artisans and labourers, soldiers, government servants, etc. Within a class, Hindus and Musalmans were often indistinguishable from each other in dress, housing, etiquette and manners, whether in villages or in towns. The position of woman, the age of marriage and even some wedding ritual were uniform within a class and common to its Hindu and its Muslim members. It was only natural that Hindus and Muslims should join one another's festivals. There was a broad identity of economic interests which held a class together and cut across the religious cleavage. Behind it all was the similarity in the standards set up by Hindu and Muslim ethical codes.”—BENI PRASAD (a)

Section (ii)—DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HINDUS AND MUSLIMS

“ Under Baber the Turks did not present themselves in tribes, but as parts of a regular army, or by individual emigration. They were mixed, in the army and in the court, with Moghuls and Persians. They found a country already populous, and its territories fully occupied by civilised inhabitants, as well as by a race of conquerors of their own religion.....The different races met and mixed in affairs of government, on their private business, in commerce and trade. But the foreign Musulman never entirely coalesced with the native Hindu. Religion continued always to keep them widely apart in their domestic intercourse, in their amusements, their customs and their habits of thinking. They were two different elements, possessed of repulsive qualities, which, however closely pressed together, never amalgamated.”—ERSKINE (b)

“He (Baber) had entered the country as a stranger and a spoiler; he had defeated the armies and broken the power of the reigning dynasty; but the only hold which he, or his race, yet had upon the people of India was military force. Of the two great classes of which the population of India was composed, the Hindus could have little unity of feeling with their Muhammedan conquerors. Both religions are, in their particular ways, exclusive. The Hindus admit of no proselytes; regard all strangers, even their rulers, as not only far behind them in the road to final happiness, but as, at best, only successful barbarians, many of whose habits they view with disgust and abhorrence. The Musulman, too, though eager for proselytism, is an exclusive religion, which looks with hatred or contempt on every other, and is very unfavourable to the existence of much sympathy between the believing lord and the infidel subject; especially where the subject adds to his other crimes that of idolatry.”—**ERSKINE** (c)

(a) "THE HINDU MUSLIM QUESTIONS by Beni Prasad, pages 12-13.

(b) "HISTORY OF INDIA UNDER BABER AND HUMAYUN" by Erskine, Vol. I.
pp. 21-22.

(c) " " " " " " " " Vol. II, p. 4

Revivalism Responsible for Diversities

“Revivalism weaned away the half-converts from the lingering Hindu beliefs and practices. On the other hand, the Hindu sub-castes which had adopted Muslim ways of living gravitated towards Hindu revivalism or modernism. Hindus and Musalmans alike began to give up many practices which they had imbibed from one another and which had formed bridges between the two communities. Many areas of common life and thoughts have thus been restricted and many meeting places obliterated. Revivalism leads to the withdrawal of one community from the other's festivals which the natural force of sympathy and imitation tend to make common to both. It fosters a conscious retention and accentuation of existing divergences and the invention of new ones in regard to diet and dress, manners and etiquette and magnifies them all into profound ‘cultural’ diversities. It tends to diminish the common elements in the literary productions of the Hindus and the Musalmans and fosters itself by claiming control over the education of the young and founding separate schools, academies, colleges and universities. It imparts its tone to literature, favouring the elimination of Sanskrit terms from Urdu and that of Arabic terms from Hindi, Bengali and other languages. Revivalism prompts organisation on communal lines and often assumes an aggressive tone which brings the different communities into acrimonious debate over theological and other matters.”—BENI PRASAD. (a)

Indian Temperament Responsible for the present points of opposition between the communities

“‘National character’ is subtle and elusive but it seems, on the whole, that the Indian temperament delights in logic and definition, principles and abstractions and displays imaginative fervour and emotional flow. It presents a contrast to the Englishman's reserve, severe practicality, distrust of logic and principles, and turn for discipline and organisation. Parenthetically, the failure to perceive and allow for the difference is a perennial source of misunderstanding between England and India and has been partly responsible for the breakdown of some negotiations for compromise, for instance, in 1921, 1931 and 1939. The temperamental difference partly accounts for the demand for declarations on one side and the refusal or evasion on the other. From the standpoint of Hindu-Muslim relations, the psychological tendencies have been making for adjustment in some respects and mal-adjustment in a few particulars. They are responsible for a common scale of values, a deep sense of spirituality, a capacity to rise above the earth earthy and the passing exigency, a common respect for learning, character, heroism and sacrifice. The hold of principles serves to counteract many fissiparous tendencies and to secure approximation between lines of cultural development. On the other hand, the turn for abstractions has sometimes rendered compromise difficult; for example, negotiations between the National Congress and the Muslim League broke down or simply did not commence in 1938 and 1939 because of the insistence on one side and sturdy refusal on the other, of the prior recognition of the Muslim League as the sole representative of Muslim opinion and of the Congress as a Hindu organisation. It is not the merits of the demand or the refusal that call for attention here; it is the tendency to stand on abstract claims that is noteworthy. The same mentality is responsible for the presentation of political or communal claims in all their logical completeness. The emotionalism of the Indian temperament manifests itself in love for flags, slogans and songs. That these psychological characteristics are shared in equal degree by all is also proved by the readiness with which the varieties of symbolism invented by one party find their counterpart in the other party. The attachment to rival symbolisms,

springing from the same psychological characteristics has been responsible for many misunderstandings during the last five years.

It is not easy to alter temperamental traits but modern psychoanalysis points out that the first step in overcoming their disadvantages is to be conscious of them. It is necessary to realise that logic, principle, declaration and definition, though they possess great value, must be adjusted to the claims of compromise and working settlement. Especially, the transition to positive government with its numerous enterprises on the basis of large-scale co-operation calls for a practical turn of mind, a habit of give and take, of willingness to sink non-essentials, a refusal to erect trifles into principles. There is nothing in all this that really runs counter to the Indian scale of values. It is, however, a set of qualities to be brought consciously into play against the older manifestations which were suited to an environment of a negative and absolutist government."—BENI PRASAD. (a)

Conflict of Political Interests

"It is needless for me to remind here that Hindus and Muslims do not represent mere religious majorities and minorities, they are also politically, economically and socially divided. The Muslim has distinct political aspirations which urge him on to the political regeneration of his own community as well as of the Muslim world in general. He does not view with the same interest the progress of non-Muslim countries as he watches that of a Muslim country. His first concern is with the rise of Islam as a political power in the world. This ambition he conceives not with a view to suppress the liberties of other nations, but simply because he feels that the establishment of the political power of Islam will bring about a better standard of justice and equality between nations and individuals." (b)

Conflict of Economic Interests

"Economically, too, there is a clash between Hindu and Muslim interests. There are certain occupations entirely reserved for Hindus and the Muslims have been completely shut out of them. Shop-keeping in general is a monopoly of the Hindu even in purely Muslim areas. The grain and cloth markets in particular in every city are controlled by Hindus. Even in villages which lie in pure Muslim surroundings, the Hindu holds a favoured position as a money-lender or shopkeeper. The Muslim middle class in cities has no choice left except to work as labourers or to seek petty jobs in Government service. The Hindu middle class is prosperous and flourishing and controls all the internal and external trade of the country.

The Muslims cannot look upon this state of affairs as a *fait accompli*. Nor can they accept for ever the condition of being a debtor community. All their hard-earned savings passed into the hands of the Hindu money-lender in the form of the interest, which in the Punjab alone is ten times the land revenue of the Province." (c)

Divergence of Social Systems

"Socially Hindus and Muslims present two entirely different systems. The Hindu is caste-ridden and believes in certain social customs and practices which have become engrained in his daily life by the lapse of centuries. High-caste Hindu cannot dine or marry in low-caste Hindu family. Modern education has

(a) "THE HINDU MUSLIM QUESTIONS," by Beni Prasad, pages 30-32.

(b) "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION", pages 34-35.

(c) " " " " " " " 35-36.

no doubt taught the Hindu to protect the interests of Harijans and depressed classes but still he is not prepared to assign an equal status to the latter. He is still opposed to separate electorates and safeguards for Harijans and recognises no special privileges or rights for them except what they can claim as part of the Hindu Polity.

Now it is common knowledge that the working of Hindu social system in the past has led to the concentration of all economic and social power in the hands of high-caste Hindus. This cannot be said of Islam. The Muslims believe in the equality and fraternity of all. Inter-dining and inter-marriage are not obstacles among the various classes of Muslims. They believe in the equality of all before law and recognise no distinction between one Muslim and another on the basis of birth and blood. (a)

Such indeed is the divergence in the social systems of the two communities that on occasions of common social gathering when those differences are expected to be minimised, they present themselves in more striking forms. A Muslim attending a Hindu public dinner or party will miss badly things suited to his taste and will find most of the dishes prepared according to Hindu practice. In a railway journey, when opportunities of contact are of daily occurrence, the question of food and drink still divides the Hindu from the Muslim. In cities, in building a new house or taking an old one on rent, a Hindu will more readily see the company of a Hindu neighbour. In fact in every walk of life, a Muslim is more welcome to a Muslim and a Hindu to a Hindu. (b)

Two Distinct Civilisations

"India is inhabited by many races.....often as distinct from one another in origin, tradition and manner of life as are the nations of Europe. Two-thirds of its inhabitants profess Hinduism in one form or another as their religion, over 77 millions are followers of Islam; and the difference between the two is not only of religion in the stricter sense but also of law and culture. They may be said, instead, to represent two distinct and separate civilisations. Hinduism is distinguished by the phenomenon of its caste, which is the basis of its religious and social system, and, save in a very restricted field, remains unaffected by contact with the philosophies of the West; the religion of Islam, on the other hand, is based on the conception of equality of man." (c)

Hinduism and Islam are Social Codes governing Man's Relations with his Neighbours

"The British people being Christians, sometimes forget the religious wars of their own history and today consider religion as a private and personal matter between man and God. This can never be the case in Hinduism and Islam, for both these religions are definite social codes which govern not so much man's relation with his God, as man's relation with his neighbour. They govern not only his law and culture, but every aspect of his social life, and such religions, essentially exclusive, completely preclude that merging of identity and unity of thought, on which Western democracy is based, and inevitably bring about vertical rather than the horizontal divisions that democracy envisages." (d)

(a) This statement does not appear to be borne out by the facts recorded in Part III, Chapter 3.

(b) "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION," pages 37-38.

(c) Extract from the Report of The Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms (Sessions 1933-34 Vol. I, para 1), as reproduced at page 23 of "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION."

(d) "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION," pages 23-24.

Section (iii)—A NATION AT WAR WITH ITSELF

(CH. AFZAL HAQ—AHRAR)

“It would give the best cause for headache to those who might like to know what is meant by the term ‘nation’; but it will be a complacent self-deception to say without an intimate knowledge of Indian life whether Indian people constitute a nation or not. Generally speaking the term is applied to a people who have common descent, common language, common history, and common religion, but to make the term more comprehensive add upto date and three more items, i.e., common social customs, common political institutions and common economic conditions.

It is admitted on all hands that the majority of Mussalmans in this country are direct descendants of those Aryan invaders who in the obscurity of pre-historic times pressing downwards through the north-west passes settled in India. The descendants of the Mughal, Pathan and Arab invaders are few and far between. Hence if untold blessings are inherent in the fact of one nationality and if nationality depends on common blood, then Hindus and Muslims ought not to lead a cat-and-dog life as they do at present. The long and short of the matter is that prejudices that are rampant in this country like a mad lion are not due to racial hatred and we must search for their causes somewhere else. Is this then the difference of religion that has made us a nation at war with itself? Many will cry ditto to it with unshakable certainty, but I politely refuse to believe it, though that refusal may shake their long-standing belief. It is one of the ironies of history that Islam and Hinduism, inspite of highly tolerant teachings, by a series of accidents should have become unfit for enforcing tolerance on their followers. There is nothing inherently wrong in the teachings of both these religions. They teach us to live in peace and serve each other to the best of our ability. It is not religion but other revolutionary jerks that are responsible for the present state of affairs. (a)

I quite agree that the central fact of the teachings of Islam is different from that of Hinduism. According to Islam, God sends down prophets, but does not Himself take any shape or form, whereas the reverse is the case with Hinduism. However, as time passed on, new theories and conclusions were mixed up with the religious beliefs of Islam. Some mystics changed the whole phase of this religion and brought it more in agreement with the Vedanta theory of the Sanatanist Hindus. Puritans may enter the strongest protest against this attempt of the sufis, but the fact is that inspite of these protestations, Sufism is now the accepted religion of 80 per cent. of the Muslims in India. The mystic theory of the Sufis is quite in consonance with the Vedanta theory, therefore Mussalman masses in religious practices resemble Hindus. If Hindus bow down before an image of a deity, Muslims bow down before the graves of Saints and Pirs. Music and dance are prohibited by Islam, but in every Khangah you hear sweet music and see elegant dancing. (b)

• You will further see some of the religious leaders of the masses themselves dancing in ecstasy and they are so carried away by the music and dance of the prostitutes that folds of their turbans become loose and they weep and cry like little children. Ordinary prostitutes have taken the place of 'Dev Dasis' in the shrines of Muslim Sufis. Music and dance are now as much a part of the Muslim religion as that of the Hindus. The question of music before mosques is absolutely a political stunt. I daily see and hear dance and music before the

(a) "PAKISTAN AND UNTOUCHABILITY" by Ch. Afzal Haq, pages 10-12.

(b) " " " " " 19-20

mosques near the shrines of Muslim Saints and Pirs. 'No one takes objection to it. Whoever dares to protest against it, does it at the risk of his life. (a)

If a Muslim of the first century of the Hijra were again sent down to this earth to see the state of religious affairs in India, he would at once say that 80 per cent. Mohammadans inhabiting India are 'Kaffirs' and that they have only adopted the name of 'Muslim' to gain their political ends, otherwise there is absolutely no religious difference between the Hindus and the so-called Muslims....(b)

....However it is clear from the prevailing customs of Mussalmans and the rapid growth of Khanqahs that the religious beliefs of Hindus and Muslims are not poles asunder as some people are apt to believe....(c)

....Had our differences been due to religion, then the Jamiat-ul-Ulema and the Majlis-i-Ahrar would have been more vociferous than the League in crying down the Congress and the Hindus. Last but not least, had the present complications something to do with religion, then Muslims could not be led by Mr. Jinnah, an able lawyer and politician, but admittedly the last Mussalman on earth to know anything of Islam. (d)

To the question 'is it the difference of religion that has made us a nation at war with itself,' Ch. Afzal Haq's answer is 'No.' Both religions teach toleration. Both are religions of peace and teach us to live in peace and serve each other to the best of our ability. Hinduism has no quarrel with other faiths. In Islam race or origin is neither a handicap nor a privilege. It aims at forming a classless society. It is the religion of peace. It is rigid in enforcing certain articles of faith only so far as the Muslims are concerned; but for those outside its pale it has no other message but that of good will and toleration. The Hindu-Muslim problem is not a religious one. (e)

Section (iv)—WHAT THE MUSLIMS DO NOT WANT

The Muslims do not want Hindu Majority Rule

"It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends fail to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religious in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders and it is a dream that the Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality, and this misconception of one Indian nation has gone far beyond the limits and is the cause of most of our troubles and will lead India to destruction if we fail to revise our notions in time. The Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, and literature. They neither inter-marry, nor inter-dine together and, indeed, they belong to two different civilisations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects on life and of life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Mussalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, their heroes are different, and different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other and, likewise, their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such nations under a single

(a) "PAKISTAN AND UNTOUCHABILITY" by Ch. Afzal Haq, pages 20-21.

(b) " " " " " 21.

(c) " " " " " 26.

(d) " " " " " 36.

(e) " " " " " 10-36.

state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a state. (a)

Muslim India cannot accept any constitution which must necessarily result in a Hindu Majority government. Hindus and Muslims brought together under a democratic system forced upon the minorities can only mean Hindu Raj. Democracy of the kind with which the Congress High Command is enamoured would mean the complete destruction of what is most precious in Islam." (b)

"Now it is a simple conclusion that if the Muslim Provinces remain part of a future Indian National State, they will undoubtedly enjoy a limited kind of provincial autonomy, but the final voice in the army, navy, air force and other important central subjects will be that of a Central Cabinet responsible to a Central Legislature which will be dominated by a Hindu Majority. Unless the Muslims are assured of some special advantages which they will obtain if they remain content with limited provincial autonomy in their majority provinces, there is no other consideration which can persuade or compel them to accept the majority rule at the centre.

In fact, the Muslims are convinced that by forming part of single composite nation in India, they will be losers all round and will finally sink to the position of a helpless minority which will be shorn of all final power in the supreme executive affairs of the Centre. It is for the Congress to convince the Muslims how they are going to benefit by a Hindu domination at the Centre." (c)

"He (Mr. Jinnah) has told them that if a new constitution is to lead the people of India to freedom, that freedom should be for every cultural unit and not for the majority community only. But the Hindu leaders flushed with their new power are not in a mood to come to terms with him on the basis of equality. Mr. Jinnah has asked for nothing but fair treatment. His one desire is to have for the country a constitution under which no single community, Muslim or Hindu, should gain an upper hand over the other. The High Command of the Congress, which is essentially Hindu in composition and organisation, would agree to no such proposition. It insists that the voice of the majority, of whatever sort it might be, should prevail in the administration of the country and points out in its support what happens under certain democratic constitutions, by conveniently ignoring the peculiar circumstances of India. So these people, living a most undemocratic social life, demand democratic institutions only to exploit them for swamping the whole country with the undemocratic Hindu culture!..... In their present frame of mind, they (the Muslims) recollect what they were in this country, and how it was from them that the Britisher received the *de jure* as well as the *de facto* right to rule in the country. If now, for reasons of his own, the Britisher chooses to divest himself of the right, partially or fully, they feel that it was his moral duty to see that the Muslims were not left entirely to the tender mercy of the Hindu community. They regret that the Britisher has forgotten that of the two—the Muslim and the Hindu—it is the Muslim who possesses the greater talent for administration and that it is he who supplies the largest number of soldiers to the Indian Army and has therefore a special right to control the administration of the country.....With all that the Muslim has been sensible enough not to aspire to have the chief voice in the governance of the country under the new constitution. He has simply desired to share it equally with others...." (d).

(a) "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION" page 13.

(b) " " " " " " " 14.

(c) " " " " " " " 39.

(d) "THE MUSLIM PROBLEM IN INDIA," by Dr. Abdul Latif, pp. 20-22.

"We have considered the disease and the symptoms. What is the remedy?"
 (1) The British people must realise that unqualified Western democracy is totally unsuited for India and attempts to impose it must cease. (2) In India, it must be accepted that 'party' government is not suitable and all Governments, Central or Provincial, must be Governments that represent all sections of the people." (a).

Section (v)—WHAT THE MUSLIMS WANT

"We wish to live in peace and harmony with our neighbours as a free and independent people. We wish our people to develop to the fullest our spiritual, cultural, economic, social and political life in a way that we think best and in consonance with our own ideals according to the genius of our people. Honesty demands and vital interests of millions of our people impose a sacred duty upon us to find an honourable and peaceful solution, which would be just and fair to all..." (b)

"Any solution that may be suggested should provide for two things—Cultural autonomy to each Indian nationality or community, and Political unity for India.

If these should form the indispensable needs of the country, there lie open before it one of two ways, or to be more accurate, the one leading to the other. One is to allow each community or nationality to fit into the existing conditions and adjust their relationship in a manner that may allow none to gain an upper hand over the other, and yet afford them all every moral urge to care for each other, and to work together for the lasting good of their common motherland: the other is to alter the existing conditions and create separate homelands or cultural zones for the different Indian nationalities all bound together by a common political nexus, and thus eliminate for ever the never-ending clashes arising everywhere out of the fundamental cleavage existing between their cultural ideals, and social orders." (c)

Section (vi)—MR. JINNAH'S 14 POINTS. (1928)

"The specific demand for the rights, protection and safeguards of the Minorities, though somewhat vague, was crystallized by the All-India Muslim Conference of December 31, 1928, in the shape of what have come to be known as Jinnah's 14 Points, summarized as follows:— (d)

- (1) The form of the future constitution should be federal, with the residuary powers vested in the provinces.
- (2) No bill, or resolution, or any part thereof shall be passed in any legislature or in any other elected body, if three-fourths of the members of any community in that particular body oppose such a bill, resolution, or part thereof, on the ground that it would be injurious to the interests of that community, or in the alternative, such other method is devised as may be found feasible and practicable to deal with such cases.
- (3) Representation of communal groups shall continue to be by means of separate electorates, as at present, provided it shall be open to any

(a) "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION", page 28.

(b) "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION" page 14.

(c) "THE MUSLIM PROBLEM IN INDIA", by Dr. Abdul Latif, pages 24, 26.

(d) The above Summary is reproduced from "WHITHER MINORITIES?" by M. N. DALAL, pages 76-79.

community at any time to abandon the separate electorates in favour of joint electorates.

- (4) No cabinet, either central or provincial, should be formed without there being a proportion of one-third Muslim ministers.
- (5) Any territorial redistribution, that might at any time be necessary, shall not in any way affect the Muslim majority in the Punjab, Bengal or the North-West Frontier Province.
- (6) All legislatures in the country and other elected bodies shall be constituted on the definite principle of adequate and effective representation of minorities in every province, without reducing the majority in any province to a minority or even equality.
- (7) Sind should be separated from the Bombay Presidency.
- (8) Reforms should be introduced in Baluchistan and North-West Frontier Province, on the same lines as in other provinces.
- (9) In the central legislature Muslim representation shall not be less than one-third.
- (10) Provision should be made in the constitution giving Muslims adequate share, along with other Indians, in all services of the States, and in all local self-governing bodies, having regard to the requirements of efficiency.
- (11) The constitution should embody adequate safeguards for the protection of Muslim culture, and for the protection and promotion of Muslim education, language, religion, personal law, and Muslim charitable institutions, and for their due share in the grants-in-aid given by the State, and by the local self-governing bodies.
- (12) A uniform measure of autonomy shall be granted to all provinces.
- (13) Full religious liberty, that is, liberty of worship, and observance, propaganda, association and education, shall be guaranteed to all communities.
- (14) No change shall be made in the constitution by the central legislature, except with the concurrence of the States constituting the Indian federation.

Section (vii)—Mr. JINNAH'S 11 POINTS (1938)

In June 1938 The All India Muslim League presented the following eleven demands to the Congress:— (a)

1. The Bande-Mataram song should be given up;
2. Muslim majorities in the provinces where such majorities exist at present must not be affected by any territorial redistribution or adjustment;
3. Muslims' practice of cow-slaughter must not be interfered with;
4. Muslims' right to call Azan and perform their religious ceremonies should not be fettered in any way;
5. Muslims' personal law and culture should be guaranteed by statute;
6. The share of the Muslims in the State services should be definitely fixed in the Constitution by a statutory enactment;

7. The Congress should withdraw all opposition to the Communal Award, and should not describe it as a negation of nationalism;
8. Statutory guarantee should be given that the use of Urdu shall not be curtailed;
9. Representation in local bodies should be governed by the principles underlying the Communal Award, that is, separate electorates and population strength;
10. The Tri-colour Flag should be changed or alternatively the flag of the Muslim League should be given equal importances;
11. Recognition of the League as the one and only authoritative and representative organisation of the Indian Muslims.

Section (viii)—THE HINDU DEPRESSED CLASSES LEADER'S CONCEPTION OF A POSSIBLE MUSLIM ALTERNATIVE TO PAKISTAN

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Leader of the Hindu Depressed Classes, suggests the following as his conception of a possible Muslim alternative to Pakistan:—(a)

“That the future constitution of India shall provide:

- (i) that the Muslims shall have 50% representation in the Legislature, Central as well as Provincial, through separate electorates;
- (ii) that $\frac{1}{2}$ of the Executive in the Central as well as in the Provinces shall consist of Muslims;
- (iii) that in the Civil Service 50% of the posts shall be assigned to the Muslims;
- (iv) that in the Fighting Forces the Muslim proportion shall be one half, both in the ranks and in the higher grades;
- (v) that Muslims shall have 50% representation in all public bodies such as councils and commissions, created for public purposes;
- (vi) that Muslims shall have 50% representation in all international organisations in which India will participate;
- (vii) that if the Prime Minister be a Hindu, the Deputy Prime Minister shall be a Muslim;
- (viii) that if the Commander-in-Chief be a Hindu, the Deputy Commander-in-Chief shall be a Muslim;
- (ix) that no changes in the Provincial boundaries shall be made except with the consent of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the Muslim members of the Legislatures;
- (x) that no action or treaty against a Muslim country shall be valid unless the consent of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the Muslim members of the Legislatures is obtained;
- (xi) that no law affecting the culture or religion or religious usage of Muslims shall be made except with the consent of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the Muslim Members of the Legislatures;

- (xii) that the national language for India shall be Urdu;
- (xiii) that no law prohibiting or restricting the slaughter of cows or the propagation of and conversion to Islam shall be valid unless it is passed with the consent of 2/3rds of the Muslim members of the Legislatures;
- (xiv) that no change in the constitution shall be valid unless the majority, required for effecting such changes also includes a 2/3rds majority of the Muslim members of the Legislatures.

CHARGES AND COUNTER-CHARGES!

(May The Lord Save Us!)

SURA—XXXI—LUQMAN (THE WISE).

19. And be moderate

سُوْرَةُ لُقْمَانَ مَكِّيَّةٌ

In thy pace, and lower

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

Thy voice; for the harshest

وَافِضْ ذِي مَشِيكَ وَأَعْضُضْ مِنْ

Of sounds without doubt

صَوْتِكَ إِنْ أَسْكَدَ

Is the braying of the ass.

الْأَصْوَاتِ لَصَوْتِ الْحَمِيرَةِ

(The Holy Qur'an, Text, Translation and Commentary, by

Abdullah Yusuf Ali—1938)..

Section (ix)—THE MUSLIM LEAGUE'S CHARGES AGAINST THE CONGRESS GOVERNMENTS.

The Council of the All-India Muslim League passed the following resolution at its meeting held on March 20, 1938, at Delhi:—

“Whereas numerous complaints have reached the Central Office of the hardship, ill-treatment and injustice that is meted out to the Muslims in various Congress Government Provinces and particularly to those who are workers and members of the Muslim League, the Council resolves that a special committee be appointed consisting of the following members to collect all informations, make all necessary inquiries, and take such steps as may be considered proper and to submit their report to the President and the Council from time to time: Raja Syed Mohammad Mehdi of Pirpur, Chairman, Mr. A. B. Habibullah (Secretary), Khan Bahadur Haji Rashid Ahmad, Syed Ashraf Ahmad, Molvi Abdul Ghani, M.L.A., Mian Ghias-uddin, M. L. A., Syed Zakir Ali, Syed Hasan Riaz, Syed Taqi Hadi Naqvi.”

The Report was submitted on November 15, 1938. It is dealt with in detail in Part III, Chapter 4. The Muslim charges against Congress Governments briefly are:—

- (1) That the Muslims' right to offer cow sacrifice was interfered with.
- (2) That attempts were made to stop the Azan, the Muslim call to prayers.
- (3) That music was deliberately played before mosques causing disturbance to the Muslims engaged in prayers within.
- (4) That attempts were made to supplant the Urdu language by the Hindi language.

- (5) That the Bande Mataram song was sung as the National Anthem at mixed gatherings where Muslims were present although the song is considered by the Muslims as detrimental to their nationalism.
- (6) That the Congress tri-colour flag was used as the National Flag of India although it is not accepted by the Muslims as such.
- (7) That socially the Muslims were treated as untouchables.
- (8) That when riots broke out, the Congress Governments failed to protect the Muslims.

Section (x)—THE HINDU MAHASABHA'S CHARGES AGAINST THE MUSLIM GOVERNMENTS

"Nine charges were framed by the Mahasabha Session of December 1938 by a resolution opening with the preamble "The Mahasabha strongly condemns the reactionary, one-sided and oppressive policy followed by the Punjab Government", the last charge in the catalogue being "it (the Punjab Government) is generally behaving in an autocratic and despotic manner and making every effort to favour Muslims at the expense of the Hindus and creating a poisonous atmosphere against them in the Province." (a)

Extract from a resolution of the Working Committee of the All India Hindu Mahasabha, dated Calcutta 14/15th June 1941:—

"The Committee further notes that inspite of the Viceroy's declaration of the responsibility of Governors for the protection of the interests of minority communities, Hindu interests in Sind, North-Western-Frontier Province, the Punjab and Bengal continue to be systematically assailed and in Eastern Bengal, in particular, the Hindu community did not get any adequate protection during the recent anti-Hindu rising of the Muslims" (b)

Extract from the Report of the Punjab, Sind and Frontier Hindu Conference held at Lahore on 1st March 1941:—

"Tales of 'suffering and misery' of the Hindus of Sind and the Frontier Province were narrated by speakers from the Provinces at the Conference.

Mr. Bhojraj Rajwani, General Secretary, Sind Provincial Hindu Sabha, referred to what he described as the havoc caused by communal fanatics in Sind. He warned that if Hindus of other provinces did not come to their rescue, they would not hesitate to migrate to the neighbouring provinces as suggested by Mahatma Gandhi.

Rai Bahadur Meher Chand Khanna, Leader of the Hindu-Sikh Nationalist Party in the Frontier Assembly, said "that the situation in respect of the life and property of Hindus in the Frontier Province was worse than the plight of Hindus in Sind." (c)

Extract from a resolution of the Working Committee of the All India Hindu Mahasabha, dated Calcutta, 14/15th June 1941:—

"The campaign of the Pakistan riots already set on foot by the Muslims makes it imperative that Hindu Sanghathanists throughout India should organise themselves on a national scale, and should be prepared in every

(a) "THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER". 1938 Vol. II, pages 341-42.

(b) " " " " " 1941 Vol. I, page 283.

(c) " " " " " " " " 285.

locality to defend their hearths, homes, temples, Hindu rights, and above all, Hindu honour, consolidating all available forces to resist the dangers facing Hindusthan...." (a)

Section (xi)—OUR MUSLIM AND HINDU CULTURES! OUR HINDU AND MUSLIM CIVILIZATIONS!

Samples that Speak!

Public Order by the Superintendent of Police, Karachi and Tatta Districts, approved of by the District Magistrate, under the provision of section 48 of the Bombay Police Act, IV of 1890, to regulate religious and public processions, the playing of music and the preservation of the public peace during the period of the Muharram:— (b)

1. No procession or assembly of persons may convey or carry about a Tabut, Punja, Tajia, or the like on the public roads or in the public streets and thoroughfares during the Muharram ceremonies unless and until a license has been obtained to erect or carry about the Tabut, Punja, or Tajia under the authority of the Superintendent of Police.
2. No person may be a member of any assemblage or procession connected with any Tabut, Punja, Tajia, or the like, except when a license has been granted to carry such Tabut, or Punja, or Tajia.
3. All persons obtaining such licenses must produce them whenever required to do so by any Magistrate or Police Officer. No fee will be charged for licenses.
4. Every such license-holder will be held responsible for the peaceful behaviour of the persons composing any assemblage or procession connected with his Tabut, Punja, Tajia, or the like, and shall enforce the good behaviour of all such persons. The above clause shall be deemed to be one of the conditions of the license. In the event of any such persons being found guilty of any riotous or disorderly conduct in any such assemblage or procession, the Superintendent or the officer deputed by him on this duty may, should he see fit, at once withdraw such license by verbal notification that the same is withdrawn, and all persons composing such assembly or procession shall immediately disperse and shall not reassemble or continue to carry about the Tabut, Punja, Tajia, or the like, belonging thereto.
5. No music may be played in any of the streets or thoroughfares of Karachi, except under the authority of a license issued by the Superintendent of Police. The licensees must comply with the terms and conditions of the license issued to them.
6. No procession, accompanied by music, may parade any of the streets or thoroughfares and no person may join in, or be a member of, any such procession, except when a license to play music with such procession has been obtained as mentioned in paragraph 5.
7. No person may go in procession with Tabut, Punja, Tajia, or the like, on the last night of the Muharram before 8 o'clock or continue in

(a) "THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1941, Vol. I, page 284.

(b) THE SIND GOVERNMENT GAZETTE, Part I, Dated the 8th January 1942, page 43.

procession after 3 o'clock on following morning or on the last day before 11 o'clock a. m. on which day the ceremony must be concluded by sunset.

8. Two or more Tabuts, Punjas, Tajias, or the like, may not proceed abreast on the public road, and when two Tabuts, Punjas, Tajias, or the like meet, each Tabut, Punja, Tajia, or the like must keep to the left to make way for the other. On meeting carriages and horses, persons accompanying the Tabuts, Punjas, Tajias, and the like, must keep to the left side of the road, the playing of music must cease, and all facilities for such carriages and horses to pass undisturbed must be allowed, and no noise shall be made or banners waved until such carriages and horses shall have passed.
9. No person may carry a sword, dirk, bludgeon or other offensive weapon.
10. On a procession approaching any place of public worship during the hours of worship, the music shall cease and the procession pass such places of worship without noise.
11. Every member of any assemblage or procession connected with or accompanying and Tabut, Punja, Tajia, or the like, shall promptly observe all directions connected with the keeping of order and the regulation of traffic and the removal of obstruction in the public roads, streets, thoroughfares and places of public resort given by Police Officers on duty with the processions.
12. A Tabut, Punja, Tajia, or the like, that has once started in procession in the public street shall be carried in the usual manner to its customary destination and then taken to its original starting place, without delay. It shall not be placed on the ground in any public street, place or thoroughfare without the express permission of the Senior Police Officer present.
13. Processions to be held in connection with the Muharram ceremonies will only be permitted on the public street between 1st and 10th Muharram.
14. Any person violating the above rules or behaving in a disorderly manner or making a disturbance of any kind, will be immediately taken into custody and dealt with according to law.

(Sd.) A. W. PRYDE

*Superintendent of Police,
Karachi and Tatta District.*

Public Order by the Superintendent of Police, Karachi and Tatta Districts under Section 48 of the Bombay District Police Act, IV of 1890, to regulate religious processions and for the preservation of the public peace during the festival of the DASSERA on Sunday, the 18th October, 1942, within the Municipal limits of Karachi.

"That no person may carry a sword, dirk, bludgeon, lathi or other offensive weapon. That use of gestures, dissemination of pictures, symbols, placards, or any other object or thing which may probably inflame religious animosity or hostility or excitement between different classes, or may probably incite to the commission of an offence detrimental to the maintenance of public peace, or to resistance to, or contempt of, the law or lawful authority, are prohibited.

(Sd.) A. W. PRYDE

- (a) THE SIND GOVERNMENT GAZETTE, Part I, dated the 24th September, 1942 page 2079.
- (b) "THE HINDU MUSLIM QUESTIONS," by Beni Prasad, Pages 164-65.
- (c) "THE HINDU MUSLIM QUESTIONS," by Beni Prasad, Pages 164-65.

inhuman type disgraced the city. Innocent people and unwary passers-by were done to death most brutally because of their owing allegiance to a religion which the rioters did not profess. Hooliganism let loose took its toll of life and property. Indiscriminate assaults and stab wounds were committed in cold blood, causing serious injuries and numerous head-breaking; temples and mosques were set on fire; rioters in disguise stalked the streets to fly at the earliest opportunity at the throats of those subscribing to a different faith; free fights between the Hindus and Muslims took place on the streets; shops and houses were looted and valuable articles lay scattered on the roads; the mill-hands taking contagion absented themselves from the mills and took part in the engagement; tram cars and motor cars were held up by the riff-raff elements and the passengers maltreated; business came to a dead stop. Effective police measures such as the rounding up of mawalis and goondas of ill-repute, patrolling in armoured cars by military forces through the main thoroughfares, posting of sepoy at the strategic points, opening of fire to disperse rioters, announcement of curfew orders, brought the situation under control after ten days and the city resumed its normal activities. But before long there was a recrudescence of the outrages; stabbing and lathi assaults were again in strong evidence in the city. Patrolling and stringent measures provided temporary check to the smouldering communal jealousies and peace continued to be disturbed by stray assaults, assassinations, stab wounds and head-breaking from time to time on the slightest provocation. A tense feeling and nervousness existed, and, despite all the conciliatory activities of the eminent citizens belonging to both the communities and the police precautions in the affected areas, there was no knowing when there would be an end of this unfortunate fratricidal warfare. Though the fury of the bloody feud subsided, sporadic outbursts of incendiarism continued to play havoc to the end of June.

The fracas developed out of a trivial incident. It is officially reported that the trouble originated with the refusal of Hindus to contribute alms for the taboos to some Mahomedan boys who were collecting money for the ensuing Muharram. It appears that when the boys went to the house of the Mooltanis (Sindhi Hindus) in Nagdevi Street and asked for money, the latter refused. Evidently annoyed at this the boys behaved rudely, the Mooltanis assaulted the boys and turned them out. On hearing this, a crowd of Muslims came to the spot, but they were surprised by a shower of sodawater bottles from above resulting in a few Muslims being injured. This infuriated the Muslims who retorted by attacking the Hindus on the road. The trouble soon spread to Crawford Market, Bhendi Bazar and Mohamed Ali Road where stones were thrown at tramcars by the Moslem crowds and stray Hindu passers-by were attacked. The venue gradually shifted to the mill area and the Hindu residential locality in the northern quarters and for several days the city was the scene of bloody communal battles which took an unusual toll in casualties... Upto June 30, the casualties included 184 killed and 2077 injured. Besides this the disturbance extracted a heavy toll in loss of property. Hundreds of shops were looted and the contents wantonly destroyed; the loss to the mercantile community due to the dislocation of business can be more imagined than computed." (a)

That was in 1932. In 1938 the Pirpur Committee recorded as under:— (b)

"Communal riots have unfortunately become more frequent in the Congress provinces and they have been largely the natural outcome of the disregard for law and order and disrespect for life and property preached by irresponsible Congressmen. It is a lamentable fact that not only have

(a) "THE INDIAN RECORDER," April-June 1932, pages, 304-05.

(b) THE PIRPUR COMMITTEE'S REPORT, pages 26-28.

the occasions when communal tension has resulted in violent outbreaks increased to an extent hitherto unknown, but fresh causes of friction have arisen as a result of the policy adopted by the Congress Governments....

In U. P., the Premier, Mr. G. B. Pant, was of the opinion that the objectionable propaganda of the Muslim League and the determination of the opposition to embarrass the Government was responsible for the riots. It is the duty of the Government to maintain law and order and to protect the lives and property of the citizens. In all democratic countries, the Opposition criticises the Government and yet no Government has tried to explain away its failure by accusing the Opposition of 'embarrassing the Government'.....

We believe the trouble was due to the preaching of the ideals of a party in the name of nationalism and forcing them on everybody.....

The Muslims knew that they were powerless and all that they could do was to adopt a policy of self-preservation based on peaceful relations with the majority community. It was the failure of the Congress Governments which largely depended on the support of the Hindu members to take strong measures against Hindu aggressive elements that resulted in the crop of communal disturbances all over the country."

• *The view of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha:— (a)*

"The Hindu Mahasabha views with alarm the tendency disclosed in the recent communal riots in various Provinces such as Bihar, United Provinces, Bengal and others on the occasion of the Id Festival on the part of Muslims to perform Cow sacrifice in Hindu localities in order to offend and hurt their religious feelings. The Working Committee of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha hereby points out to the Government that time has come when the authorities in charge of law and order should suppress these provocative and mischievous activities of the Muslims with strong hand.

That the General Secretary be authorized to issue a circular letter to all Provincial Hindu Sabhas to submit specific and definite instructions regarding the sacrifice of Cows in purely Hindu localities and detailed information regarding riots or disturbances arising out of it."

The Mahatma on Riots 1941 (b)

"Hindu-Muslim riots that have broken out in many important places in the country must have saddened all sane people.....We have proved ourselves barbarians and cowards in these places. Arson, loot and killing of innocent people including children have been common in almost all the places. Thousands have run away from their homes for fear of their lives.

• From the accounts received it seems that Muslim fanatics in Dacca and Ahmedabad did their worst in inflicting damage on Hindu property by looting and burning with a delirium that showed premeditation. Hindus, instead of boldly standing up and facing the mischief-makers, fled in their thousands from the danger zone. And where they did not, they were as barbarous as the assailants."

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1941, Vol. I, page 281.

(b) Extract from Mahatma Gandhi's Statement dated Sewagram, 4th May, 1941, INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1941, Vol II, page 182.

Section (xiii) 'OUR SELF-DETERMINATION!'

Blow for Blow—Private Armies—Civil War!

"Muslim India cannot accept any constitution which must necessarily result in a Hindu majority government. Hindus and Muslims brought together under a democratic system forced upon the minorities, can only mean Hindu Raj. Democracy of the kind with which the Congress High Command is enamoured would mean the complete destruction of what is most precious in Islam. We have had ample experience of the working of the provincial constitutions during the last two and a half years and any repetition of such a government must lead to civil war and raising of private armies as recommended by Mr. Gandhi to Hindus of Sukkur when he said that they must defend themselves violently or non-violently, blow for blow, and if they could not they must emigrate." (a)

With, Without, Inspite!

"If you come, with you;
If you don't, without you;
And if you oppose, inspite of you
the Hindus will continue to fight
for their
National Freedom as best they can."

Mr. Savarkar to the Muslims—(b).

Determined to Frustrate!

"The Punjab Provincial Conference at its session at Lyallpur on 1st May, 1943 adopted a resolution which recorded "strong protest against any scheme for the partition of India. It condemns in strongest terms possible the movement carried by the Muslim League and views with contempt the threats of violence held out by Mr. Jinnah and his colleagues in their speeches during the Delhi session of the Muslim League. It expresses the determination of the Hindus of the Punjab to frustrate all such movements and calls upon the Hindus and other nationalists all over India to do all that lies in their power to oppose every scheme of vivisection of India as any such scheme strikes at the very root of Indian nationalism and jeopardises the peace, safety and independence of India." (c)

We Shall Not Negotiate!

New Delhi, June 26, 1943—Pt. Chandra Gupta Vidyalkar, Secretary of the Hindu Mahasabha, sent the following telegram on Wednesday to Dr. Hemandas, Sind Minister, who is reported to be negotiating with Mr. Jinnah to bring about an understanding between Hindus and Muslims: (d)

"Hindu Mahasabha and Mr. Savarkar cannot and shall not have any negotiations with Mr. Jinnah and his League unless League declares faith in Akhand Hindusthan and representation on population basis."

(a) "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION," page 14.

(b) INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER 1939, Vol. II, page 311.

(c) *The Daily Gazette*, Karachi, dated the 2nd May, 1943.

(d) 27th June

Swords Will Be Unsheathed !

Addressing a crowded meeting in the Hindu College in connection with Guru Nanak's birthday celebrations, Sir Jogendra Singh said:—

“....I now ask you (Mr. Jinnah) to stay with us and stand for the integrity of India. But, if you must go, then we say, please go out at once and no more stand in the way of India's progress. You can claim Pakistan only in a part of the Punjab, on the other side of the Chenab, but remember that most of the tribal stock comes from the same as myself and that blood is thicker than water. Guru Nanak has enjoined on us neither to be afraid of any one nor to give a chance to others to be afraid of us. We have been told also that, when all others means fail, it is right to unsheath the sword. We have faith in God and in the strong arm of our sons to guard our frontiers. We believe that to those who belong to God victory attends them, for victory is of God.”

CHAPTER III

OUR UNTOUCHABLES

THE AVARANAS

THE DEPRESSED CLASSES

THE SUPPRESSED CLASSES

THE SCHEDULED CASTES

THE HARIJANS

About FIVE CRORES

Out of the total Hindu population
of about $25\frac{1}{2}$ crores.
PROPORTION 1 : 4

THE MOMINS

THE MAIMALS

THE AJLAFS

THE ARZALS

About FIVE CRORES

Out of the total Muslim population
of about $9\frac{1}{2}$ crores.
PROPORTION 50 : 50.

About 10 CRORES "DEPRESSED" human beings
out of India's total population
of about 39 crores !

SLAVES AND SUB-SLAVES !

OUR UNTOUCHABLES

(MAY THE LORD FORGIVE US)

The Hindu Untouchables

When one speaks of the Communal Question, ordinarily one has in mind the Hindu-Muslim Communal Question. There is, however, another Communal Question, not less important. It is the Question of the Hindu Untouchables in relation to the Caste Hindus: of the Muslim Depressed Classes in relation to the Muslim Community: of both as a part of the Country's Communal and Political problems.

According to the last Census, the Hindu Untouchables numbered over five crores, the Muslim Depressed classes also about five crores. The magnitude of the problem, so far as the number of human beings affected is concerned, will thus be obvious. The following extracts will show what modern historians have recorded on the subject:—

"The Hindu Caste System Its Demerits (a)

The demerits of the peculiar Hindu institution are obvious. Anybody can perceive that it shuts off Indians from free association with foreigners, thus making it difficult for the Indian to understand the foreigner, and for the stranger to understand the Indian. It is easier for the English administrator to attain full sympathy with the casteless Burman than it is for him to draw aside the veil which hides the inmost thoughts of the Chitpawan or Namburdi Brahman. No small part of the mystery which ordinarily confines interest in Indian subjects to a narrow circle of experts is due ultimately to caste. It is not pleasant for an Englishman or Frenchman to know that, however distinguished he may be personally, the touch of his hand is regarded as a pollution by his high-caste acquaintance. Yet that is the disagreeable fact. Within India caste breaks up society into thousands of separate units, frequently hostile one to the other, and always jealous. The institution necessarily tends to hinder active hearty cooperation for any purpose, religious, political or social. All reformers are conscious of the difficulties thus placed in their path. Each individual finds his personal liberty of action checked in hundreds of ways unknown to the dwellers in other lands. The restrictions of caste rules collide continually with the conditions of modern life, and are the source of endless inconveniences. The institution is a relic of the ancient past and does not readily adapt itself to the requirements of the twentieth century. Although necessity compels even the strictest Brahmans to make some concessions to practical convenience, as, for instance, in the matters of railway travelling and drinking pipe water, the modifications thus introduced are merely superficial. The innate antique sentiment of caste exclusiveness survives in full strength and is not weakened materially even by considerable laxity of practice. The conflict between caste regulations and modern civilizations is incessant, but caste survives. Further, the institution fosters intense class pride, fatal to a feeling of brotherhood between man and man. The Malbar Brahman who considers himself defiled if an outcaste stands within twenty

(a) "The Oxford History of India from the Earliest Times to the end of 1911" by Vincent Smith, p. 40.

paces of him cannot possibly be interested in a creature so despised. The sentiment pervades all classes of Hindu society in varying degrees of intensity. Such objections to the caste institution, with many others which might be advanced, go far to justify, or at any rate explain, the vigorous denunciations of the system found abundantly in Indian literature as well as in the writings of foreigners. Four stanzas by Vemana, the Telugu poet, may serve as a summary of the numerous Indian diatribes on the subject:

CASTE.

If we look through all the earth,
Men, we see, have equal birth,
Made in one great brotherhood,
Equal in the sight of God.

Food or caste or place of birth
Cannot alter human worth.

Why let caste be so supreme?

'Tis but folly's passing stream.....

Empty is a caste dispute;

All the castes have but one root.

Who on earth can e'er decide?

Whom to praise and whom deride?

Why should we the Pariah scorn,

When his flesh and blood were born

Like to ours? What caste is He

Who doth dwell in all we see? (a)

The dictum of Sir Henry Maine, the eminent jurist, that caste is 'the most disastrous and blighting of human institutions' may suffice as a sample of adverse opinions expressed by European writers.

The Merits of Caste (b)

The hostile critics have not got hold of the whole truth. Much may be said on the other side, which needs to be presented. An institution which has lasted for thousands of years, and has forced its passage down through the peninsula all the way to Cape Comorin in the face of the strongest opposition, must have merits to justify its existence and universal prevalence within the limits of India. The most ardent defenders of caste, of course, must admit its unsuitability for other lands. 'Thinking men', as Sir Madhava Row observed, 'must beware lest the vast and elaborate social

(a) Gover, "THE FOLK-SONGS OF SOUTHERN INDIA" London, Trubner, 1872.

(b) "THE OXFORD HISTORY OF INDIA from the Earliest Times to the end of 1911", Vincent Smith, p. 41.

structure which has arisen in the course of thousands of years of valuable experience should be injured or destroyed without anything to substitute, or with a far worse structure to replace it! The institution of caste cannot be treated properly as a thing by itself. It is an integral part of Hinduism, that is to say, of the Hindu social and economic system. It is, as Ketkar justly observes, intimately associated with the Hindu philosophical idea of *Karma*, rebirth, and the theory of the three *gunas*. But such abstract ideas cannot be discussed in this place. More writers than one have observed that the chief attribute of the caste system regarded historically is its stability. The Hindu mind clings to custom, and caste rules are solidified custom. That stability, although not absolute, has been the main agent in preserving Hindu ideas of religion, morals, art, and craftsmanship. The Abbe Dubois was much impressed by the services which the institution renders to social order. Monier Williams concisely observes that 'caste has been useful in promoting self-sacrifice, in securing subordination of the individual to an organised body, in restraining vice, and in preventing pauperism! Similar quotations might be largely multiplied.

The future of caste

With reference to the future, the practical conclusion is that talk about the abolition or even the automatic extinction of caste is futile. Caste within India cannot be either abolished or extinguished within a measurable time. The system grew up of itself in remote antiquity because it suited India, and will last for untold centuries because it still suits India, on the whole, in spite of its many inconveniences. Hindu society without caste is inconceivable. Reformers must be content to make the best of a system which cannot be destroyed. The absolutely indispensable compromises with modern conditions will arrange themselves from time to time, while the huge mass of the Indian agricultural population will continue to walk in the ancestral ways. The deep waters of Hinduism are not easily stirred. Ripples on the surface leave the depths unmoved." (a)

The following is an extract from: "*INDIA IN 1924-25*" by L. F. Rushbrook Williams, pages 262-265:—

"Closely connected with the question of sanitation, in which are involved many of the customs and habits springing from the social heritage of the Indian people, is the progress of social reform. The more characteristic problems of the country centre round the *institution of caste*. Originally concerned with the preservation of ceremonial purity in social relations the caste system has in the course of ages developed in to an institution which rigidly assigns to each individual his position and his duties in the structure of orthodox Hinduism. Whole classes of the community are thus separated, as it were, into water-tight compartments: and since a Hindu is not affected by anything done outside his caste, the system is compatible with many practices which run directly counter to modern conceptions of humanity. Among the unfortunate results to which Hinduism has given rise must be counted the existence of the depressed classes who number about 60 millions (b). They are 'Untouchables'; that is to say, contact with them entails ceremonial purification on the part of the higher castes. In some parts of the country, they may be fairly termed 'Unapproachables'; since even their proximity implies pollution.

(a) "THE OXFORD HISTORY OF INDIA from the Earliest Times to the end of 1911", by Vincent Smith, page 42.

(b) Now about 50 millions according to the Census of 1941.

At present, large numbers of them are obliged to reside beyond the purlieus of cities and villages. The disabilities to which they are exposed appear very strange to the Western observer. They are denied the use of temples, inns and public wells; and their children are not customarily admitted into the ordinary schools. They may not enter certain streets. The minutest operations of their daily life are rigidly controlled and fettered by their position. Social ostracism so degrading, persisting through many centuries, has resulted in the erection of serious obstacles to manliness, independence and self help. As a natural consequence, millions of them live in conditions so insanitary that it is difficult even for the most liberal minded members of the higher castes to think of them in terms of common humanity. The main obstacle to their elevation lies in the social traditions observed by the great majority of the caste community. Matters have proceeded so far that the depressed classes themselves often refuse to allow Brahmin workers to enter their house to help them, believing that the touch of a higher caste is a forerunner of evil. The State has done what lies in its power to solve the problem. So far as the law itself is concerned, there is nothing to prevent any member of the depressed classes from rising to the highest position. Systematic efforts have been made to encourage the spread of the co-operative movements among them, and to afford them the benefit of increased educational facilities. In many provinces special scholarships are provided for them; and stress is laid upon their right to participate in the educational machinery. It is encouraging to notice that the proportion of the depressed class pupils is everywhere rising, although their numbers are still infinitesimal as compared with the size of their community. But it is impossible adequately to solve the problem until the social sense of the Indian people advances to a level at which certain customs, inherited from a more primitive age, will be recognised as a slur upon the good name of the country. In which connection it is important to notice that the public conscience is gradually awakening to the seriousness of the untouchability question. Among living Indians Mr. Gandhi has done most to impress upon his fellow-countrymen the necessity for elevating the depressed classes. His influence has unquestionably served to arouse widespread interest in this problem. When he was at the height of his reputation the more orthodox sections of opinion did not dare to challenge his schemes. Of late, however, there have been signs that certain schools of thought are prepared to dispute both the necessity and, indeed, the desirability of introducing any widespread reform of the caste system. This much at least is certain; if the problem of untouchability is to be solved, the solution must come not from Government but from the people themselves. Voluntary agencies are already active among the depressed classes. The educational work of the various Christian Missionary societies as well as of organisations other than Christian in their inspiration, is beyond all praise. Schools in large numbers for the education of depressed classes have been founded; and a body of public opinion is gradually arising which recognises that these unfortunates have a claim to be treated as fellow human beings. Already some impression is being created upon the stout wall of orthodox opinion. Last year, a body so representative of Hinduism as the Hindu Mahasabha passed a resolution removing from the untouchables the ban in regard to schools, public wells, meeting places, and temples. More important still, there are slight but significant indications in many parts of the country that class consciousness is slowly awakening among the untouchables. During the period under review a campaign of passive resistance was inaugurated, within the boundaries of an Indian State, to assert the rights of the untouchables to enter some of the roads round the famous temple at Vykom. Further, the-

more enlightened members of the depressed classes are beginning to organise themselves. Meetings are now held from time to time which are widely attended by representative members of the community. There is much plain speaking concerning the insanitary habits and educational backwardness which prevent the depressed classes from rising in the world, coupled with the expression of a fixed determination to resent effectively the degrading disabilities imposed upon them. Such symptoms as these, which seem to indicate the growth of a new spirit of self-help, tend to encourage the hope that the problem of the depressed classes is not insoluble."

The following extracts from Henry Beveridge's HISTORY OF INDIA will be found informative:—

"The variety of castes originating in these and similar connections has in course of time been almost indefinitely multiplied. At first difference of caste served only to indicate difference of race; but now, though this object is not overlooked, the great purpose which it serves is to regulate the kind of employment which each individual is destined to follow. To every caste a particular occupation is exclusively assigned; and thus, all trades and professions being regarded as hereditary are transmitted without interruption from father to son in the same tribes or families. It is hence easy to see that the number of castes being as unlimited as that of the modes of employment, an enumeration of them is as difficult as it would be superfluous. ...

This system of caste, accompanied with hereditary occupation, may have the effect of securing superiority of workmanship. The whole mind being employed on one branch of trade and not permitted to look beyond it, must in a manner concentrate its faculties so as to devise the best means of performing the appointed task, while the bodily power constantly engaged in the same operation must, as in the ordinary case of a minute division of labour, attain to great mechanical skill. These advantages, however, poorly compensate for the numerous evils with which they are inseparably connected. The mechanical skill which an hereditary weaver acquires, and the beautiful fabric which he produces by means of a loom of the simplest and rudest structure, cannot be viewed without some degree of admiration; but how soon is that admiration turned into regret when it is considered that the same invariable routine has been followed for ages, and that improvement has not only not been attempted, but if attempted, would have been fiercely and fanatically resisted. Every man's boast is, that he does exactly as his father did before him; and thus amid a general stagnation of intellect, society is not permitted to take a single step in advance. There may be some truth in the observation, that if caste is unfavourable to progress, it also tends to prevent degeneracy, and that hence, while other nations without caste have retrograded, India has maintained its ancient civilization.

Dubois adopting this idea goes so far as to say, 'I consider the institution of caste among the Hindu nations as the happiest effort of their legislation; and I am well convinced that if the people of India never sunk into a state of barbarism, and if, when almost all Asia was plunged in that dreary gulf, India kept up her head, preserved and extended the sciences, the arts, and civilization, it is wholly to the distinction of castes that she is indebted for that high celebrity. (a)

(a) Dubois, "DESCRIPTION OF THE CHARACTER, MANNERS, AND CUSTOMS OF INDIA" page 14.

Again, 'I have found out no cause that can have prevented Hindus from falling into the barbarous state in which all the nations bordering on them, as well as most others that are spread over the globe under the torrid zone, remain, unless it be the division into castes, which, by assigning to every individual in the state his profession and employment, by perpetuating the system from father to son, from generation to generation, prevents the possibility of any member of the state or his descendants giving up the condition or pursuit which the law has assigned him for any other. (a)

Mr. Ward, the Protestant Missionary, spoke more wisely when he said, 'The institution of the caste, so far from having contributed to the happiness of society, has been one of its greatest scourges. It is the formation of artificial orders, independently of merit or demerit, dooming nine-tenths of the people, before birth, to a state of mental and bodily degradation, in which they are for ever shut out from all the learning and honours of the country. (b)

Said the Lord Krishna to Arjuna (c)

"All the same I respond to their worship according to the nature of their worship. Every human being has a tendency to offer worship and this is directed towards Me, but those who are in error and whose intelligence is wobbling, do not realise the unity of Me, and run after many forms. Where I am one, they imagine many. Where I have no name, they give names to Me. Where I have no description, they set up little gods and goddesses. I who am everywhere at all times and in equal strength, am differentiated by them as inferior and superior. Their intelligence being muddled, they create a hierarchy.

Even with devotion, the erring ones offer worship accompanied by many rituals to all sorts of gods. They do secure as a result of their worship what they desire. But the secret of this is not known to them. There is no donor in this world other than one's own actions. Fruits are produced in this world only from actions. Whatever seed is sown in the field, the fruit is produced accordingly. Whatever image is held before the mirror, the reflection appears accordingly. Whatever word is pronounced in a valley, the echo answers accordingly. Whatever worship is offered, it all reaches Me, and according to the faith, the fruit thereof is produced.

In this way the four sections of the community were also constituted according to their actions and their quality. Their obligations were fixed according to their inherent nature. Otherwise every one is equal. It is only the qualities and the actions which cause differentiation. I have not caused the differentiation. Though I am the source of every thing, yet I have not made them what they are."

Through the ages the lowest of the four sections, the Sudras, the non-Caste Hindu millions untold, have accepted unchallenged this position in respect of themselves as "ordained by the Lord." Through the ages the Caste Hindus have placed their own interpretation on the position, imposed numerous disabilities upon these unfortunates which the Lord Shri Krishna

(a) Dubois, "DESCRIPTION OF THE CHARACTER, MANNERS, AND CUSTOMS OF INDIA" page 15.

(b) Ward, "ACCOUNT OF THE WRITINGS, RELIGIONS AND MANNERS OF THE HINDOOS," page 125.

(c) GITA EXPLAINED by Dnyaneshwar Maharaj. Translation by Manu Subedar p. 77.

could never have had in mind. In fact, the Lord's own words are "Otherwise every one is equal...I have not caused the differentiation."

A consciousness of their degraded lot and an urge for its improvement, were awakened in them during the last two centuries. While stray reformers here and there worked for the amelioration of their hard lot, the opposition from the orthodox sections of the community remained as strong as ever. The untouchables sought relief in escape into Christianity and Islam at a pace which caused concern to orthodoxy who set up the counter movement of Shuddhi to reclaim the lost ones. This process and this counter process have continued to operate to this day.

Dr. B. S. Moonje, Ag. President, Hindu Mahasabha, in the course of a Press Statement on 'Removal of Untouchability,' issued on April 14, 1932 said:—

"...the so-called 'Untouchables' and Depressed Classes form the very foundation of Hindu society on which depends the greatness and the future destiny of the Hindus. The Hindu Mahasabha earnestly appeals to them not to rush headlong towards wanton suicide, which spells both political and religious extinction. So far as the Hindu Mahasabha and those of us who are captivated by the call of Hindu Sangathan of the Hindu Mahasabha are concerned—and they are a rapidly increasing lot—'untouchability' is wiped out of existence and is now merely a thing of past memory. It is time for Hindu Youth to rise in a body, and purge the social life of Hindus of the still lingering vestiges of 'untouchability.' Let orthodoxy take courage in both hands, sing the song of complete annihilation of 'untouchability' and declare from the house-tops that their gods and temples are not polluted by the devotional worship of their so-called 'untouchable' brethren." (a)

The advent of Democracy and the spread of education and Western ideas and ideals have helped to accentuate the desire of the untouchables to shake off the shackles of disabilities: on the other hand the Caste-Hindus have also seen the wisdom of moving with the times, and have undertaken measures to relieve the lot of the Untouchables. Mr. M. C. Raja's Bill, which was passed by the Madras Legislative Assembly on the 17th August, 1938 (b); provided for the removal of civil disabilities of Harijans in regard to "appointments to any public office, or in regard to access to public vehicles, public wells, springs, tanks, ponds, roads, pathways, sanitary conveniences, etc." Similarly, the Malabar Temple-Entry Bill which was passed by the Madras Legislative Assembly on the 8th December, 1938 (c) enabled temples in Malabar being thrown open to Harijans.

The question of Untouchability now finds a place in the deliberations of all communal and political organisations of the Hindus, e. g.,

The All-India Hindu League at its First Session held at Lucknow on the 27th and 28th July, 1940, under the Presidentship of Mr. M. S. Aney, M. L. A., adopted a resolution moved by Pandit Raj Nath Kunzru, enjoining on Hindus the duty of doing everything in their power and adopting all practical measures to eradicate untouchability and to promote equality and fraternity between caste-Hindus and the Scheduled Classes. Pandit Kunzru declared that Untouchability was a blot on Hinduism and should be eradicated forthwith.....Dr. Maneckchand Jataveer, M. L. A., of Agra,

(a) The Indian Recorder, April-June, 1932, pages 313-14.

(b) Indian Annual Register, 1938, Vol. II, page 165.

(c) " " " " " " " 168.

representative of the Scheduled Classes, made an impassioned appeal for equitable treatment to his community. Through defections from Hinduism and embracing other faiths, the Hindu population during 1891-1931, he said, had declined by 11 per cent. and if measures were not taken to conserve their number, in another five centuries they would perish completely.... (a)

At the All-India Hindu Mahasabha session at Madura in December, 1940 "Mr. V. D. Savarkar moved from the chair, a resolution recommending all Hindus to intensify their efforts to remove Untouchability from the Hindu fold by educating Hindu public opinion and adopting effective measures in giving the so-called Untouchables equal social, civil, religious and public rights along with all other Hindus. Mr. Savarkar stressed that the fundamental principle of the Mahasabha was to treat all Hindus alike, and appealed to the Sanatanists (b) to concede equal rights to Untouchables in all public affairs."

The Sub-Committee of the All-India Women's Conference held at Bangalore on the 27/30th December, 1940, under the Presidents hip of Shrimati Rameshwari Nehru, in their report on 'Untouchability' pointed out that it was the duty of all Conference members and branches to re-double their efforts for the removal of untouchability. The Committee recommended among other things that each member should keep at least one Harijan as a domestic servant for work other than sanitation, that they should invite Harijans for social and religious functions and, if possible, adopt one family and serve as its god-mother, that separate quarters for Harijans should be discouraged in order to remove from this unfortunate section of humanity the brand of inferiority complex, that educational facilities should be given to Harijans and in particular to the women, and that all schools, hospitals, hotels, wells, temples and other such public places should be opened for the untouchables. The Municipalities and Government and other local bodies were asked not to give grants to educational institutions which did not admit Harijans. (a)

In his presidential address at the All-India Hindu Youth Conference Session at Madura on the 29th December, 1940, Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerjee observed, 'inter alia':—

"I ask you with all the emphasis at my command to apply your mind first and foremost to the problems of Hindusthan, to take a firm stand on the Indian soil and address yourselves to the removal of the weeds that choke the growth of healthy plants of your own once-adored garden of beauty and sweetness. In the solution of our problems we shall apply Western methods but the fundamental basis of our social and economic structure must be in accordance with those imperishable doctrines of equality and service which marked out Hinduism as one of the vital factors in the history of the world. A re-organisation of Hinduism according to modern needs and conditions is essential for the salvation of our country.

The energies of the Youth must be applied to the solution of our basic national defects which are a stumbling block to the attainment of our political freedom. Unite twenty-eight crores of Hindus by one common national ideal and inspire them with the firm conviction that their unity can and will herald the dawn of Indian liberty. We have before us the great problem of removal of those social inequalities

(a) Indian Annual Register, 1940, Vol. II, page 290.

(b) " " " " " " " 283.

(c) " " " " " " " 339.

which prevent the attainment of Hindu unity. Our society today though nominally consisting of four 'varnas' has more than three thousand castes some of which, though consisting of our own brethren, the flesh of our flesh and the blood of our blood, have been relegated to the rank of untouchables. Let the Hindu youth take up this colossal problem in right earnest and establish an invincible social brotherhood that will recognise no artificial distinctions between caste and caste and infuse an undying strength into the Hindu social order." (a)

The Hindu Mahasabha has realised the weakness and the danger that Untouchability constitutes for the Hindus, and the Bengal Mahasabha Conference held at Khulna in February 1939 presided over by Mr. Savarkar adopted the following two important resolutions on SANGATHAN and SHUDDHI which speak for themselves:—

Hindu Sangathan

"The Bengal Provincial Hindu Conference is of opinion that the work of the Hindu Sangathan, *viz.*, awakening the consciousness of solidarity among different sections and sub-sections of the Hindus has become a matter of vital necessity for the existence of the Hindus as a nation specially in Bengal where the united strength and energy of the branch Hindu Sabha should be concentrated towards this end at this crisis.

With a view to make the Hindu Sangathan work a real success, this Conference resolves.

- (a) that serious attempt be made to establish a Dharma Sabha or a public temple open to all Hindus at every village in Bengal:
- (b) that arrangements be made to hold Sarbajanik Pujas, specially Durga Puja, Doljatra, Janmashtami, and Sibratri, and that these be organised by all Hindu Sabhas without fail and that all Hindus irrespective of caste be allowed to participate in these religious functions:
- (c) that adequate attempts be made to hold prayers, sing hymns, chant religious ballads, convene Kathakata and Kirtan and readings from the Vedas, Upanishads, Geeta, Ramayana, Mahabharata, Granth Sahib, Tripitak, and other religious books regularly:
- (d) that a sense of pride and glory in being Hindus be awakened in the minds of the Hindus by introducing annual celebrations in memory of our great men, religious reformers and national heroes all over the country:
- (e) that proper propaganda be carried on to induce the Hindus to speak of themselves as Hindus only and not by any caste designation:
- (f) that encouragement be given to the introduction of inter-marriage among all castes and sections and sub-sections of the Hindus:
- (g) that adequate measures be taken to protect from social repression those Hindus who have contracted inter-marriage:
- (h) that the re-marriage of widows be popularised:
- (i) that right be given to all Hindus irrespective of caste to enter all temples and places of worship to have darshan and to worship the deities:

Whether the discontent believed to be prevailing among the millions of our Untouchables can be dismissed as mere "ripples on the surface" in the words of the above Forecast is a matter for the Sanatanist Hindus to consider. That a certain degree of discontent does exist in fact, and that the Sanatanists are aware of it and are anxious to remove it, can be gathered from their resolutions that have been quoted earlier in this chapter. The measure of success attending the Sangathan resolution of Khulna of February 1939 has evidently not been satisfactory as else there should have been no occasion for considering the establishment of a "new religion" for the Untouchables! It is for the Sanatanists to say whether a "new religion" shall or shall not come into existence.

At the same time, it is also a matter for serious consideration for the Untouchables—our Untouchables—may the Lord forgive us! Is the situation so very hopeless that relief can be found only in escape to a "new religion?" If the old religion has held for us but doubtful prospects of a heaven hereafter where there might be no distinction between caste and non-caste, high-caste and low-caste, while making our life on earth one un-ending round of social injustice and inequality, degradation, misery and unhappiness from our first to our last day, are we sure that a new religion will bring us a new earth and new heaven?

The great KABIR has sung (a)

I

1. 13. *Mo ko kahan dhunro bande*

O SERVANT, where dost thou seek Me?

Lo! I am beside thee.

I am neither in temple nor in mosque :

I am neither in Kaaba nor in Kailash :

Neither am I in rites and ceremonies,

Nor in Yoga and renunciation.

If thou art a true seeker, thou shalt at

once see Me: thou shalt meet Me

in a moment of time.

Kabir says. "O Sadhu; God is the
breath of all breath."

II

1. 16. *Santan jat na pucho nirguniyan*

It is needless to ask of a saint the caste
to which he belongs;

For the priest, the warrior, the tradesman,
and all the thirty-six castes,
alike are seeking for God.

It is but folly to ask what the caste
of a saint may be;

The barber has sought God, the
washerwoman, and the carpenter—

Even Raidas was a seeker after God.

The Rishi Swapacha was a tanner by caste.

Hindus and Muslims alike have
achieved that End, where remains
no mark of distinction.

XLII

1. 79. *Tirath men to sab pani hai*

There is nothing but water at the
holy bathing places; and I know
that they are useless, for I have
bathed in them.

The images are all lifeless, they cannot
speak; I know, for I have cried
aloud to them.

The Purana and the Koran are mere
words; lifting up the curtain, I
have seen.

Kabir gives utterance to the words of
experience; and he knows very
well that all other things are untrue.

LXIX

III. 2. *Jo khoda masjid vasat hai*

If God be within the mosque, then to
whom does this world belong?

If Ram be within the image which you
find upon your pilgrimage, then
who is there to know what happens
without?

Hari is in the East: Allah is in the
West. Look within your heart,
for there you will find both Karim
and Ram;

All the men and women of the world
are His living forms.

Kabir is the child of Allah and of
Ram: He is my Guru, He is my
Pir.

My UNTOUCHABLE sisters and brothers;

Our Lord Shri Krishna has said He has created us Untouchables as He has created the Caste-Hindus: He is the common Creator of all: He has not used one kind of clay in creating Caste-Hindus and another kind of clay in creating us Untouchables: He has said, as created by Him, Caste-Hindus and we Untouchables are *equal*, and the differentiation between them and us has not been imposed by Him. We have thus equal status with Caste-Hindus in the eyes of our Lord. Should this not be enough for the peace of our mind?

As the great Kabir has sung, our Lord does not reside in temples: He is not in rites and ceremonies: he is not in images which are lifeless, which cannot speak, which cannot hear: if they could hear and speak, if the Lord resided in images and temples, He would not have allowed the doors of His temples to remain locked against us.

No: our Lord has said He is everywhere: if He is inside the temples whose doors are closed against us, He is also outside those temples: He pervades the Universe: He is everywhere: He is wherever our eyes rest: He is close to us: He is within us, within our hearts.

With our Lord so close to our hearts what need have we to look for Him in temples?

“YE YATHA MAM PRAPADYANTE ये यथा मां प्रपद्यन्ते
TANSTATHAIVA BHAJAMYAHAM” (a) तांस्तथैव भजाम्यहम्

“...in whatever way men accept, love and take joy in God,
in that way God accepts, loves and takes joy in man.” (b)

Said the Lord to Narada

“Where two or three men are gathered together in My name,
there I am in the midst of them.”

also

नाहं वसामि वैकुण्ठे नाहं वसामि केयूरे
योगिनां हृदय दीर्घत्यम तत्र तिष्ठामि नारद

“I reside neither in heaven, nor in the ocean of milk
Oh Narada! I reside in the heart of the devotee who
yearns after me (Padma Purana)

My Untouchable sisters and brothers, we are Untouchables having been born such, which can be no fault of ours. We are denied admission to the temple in our moholla. What shall we do? If the Caste-Hindus are unjust and unkind in closing temples against us, is the Lord also unjust and unkind? No. The Lord has said “Where two or three men are gathered together in My name, there I am in the midst of them.” We may be denied entrance to Caste temples, but if we get gathered together in His name any time any where even in our twos and threes, the Lord will be there in our midst. Our own home could thus be our temple: nay, each one of us, for himself, or herself, is a temple with our Lord within ourselves, closest to our hearts. Why need we look for a temple at all? The Lord has said “in whatever way men accept, love and take joy in God, in that way God accepts, loves and takes joy in man.” If my family join me in remembering the Lord in our own home, if each one of us remembers the Lord by himself or herself, our own home becomes our temple for us, our own self becomes our temple for each one of us. I am with my Lord all the time: my Lord is with me, within me, all the time: I am my own temple: the temple is mine, and with me, within me, all the time, wherever I go. What need is there for me to seek admission to a Caste temple that is closed to me? If the Lord is behind those closed doors, is He not at the same time within me, in the inner-most recesses of my heart? This is true of me, and so it is true of every one of us. Yes, and it is now clear beyond a doubt that in seeking our Lord in temples which are denied to us, we have been blind to the Truth: we have caused ourselves pain for which in fact there was no occasion. There was no occasion for us to go out to closed temples in search of the Lord when the Lord was with and within us all the time. We now know the Truth. We are contented. We have peace at our hearts. The Caste Hindus are welcome to their temples, We no longer seek admission to their temples. We have

(a) SRIMAD-BHAGVAD-GITA, Chapter IV, Shloka 11.

(b) “ESSAYS ON THE GITA” by Shri Aurobindo Ghose, page 226.

NOTE:— For the above quotations I am indebted to Diwan Sobhraj Nirmaldas—J.F.K.

our own temples where we have our Lord who is the same One whether He be in a Caste temple responding to the chants and invocations of the twice-born, or within our humble Untouchable hearts, cognizant of every thought of our minds, uplifting our souls towards Him with every throb of our hearts.

Thus, to the question we have put ourselves above, "Is the situation so very hopeless that relief can be found only in escape to a 'new religion,'" the answer, under our Lord's guidance, would be, "NO!" We are born within the Hindu fold: so the Lord had ordained: such shall we remain through our journey on earth: our duty is to live in the way of the Lord eventually to merge our being into Him: Why, do we need a 'new religion?' Because the Caste temples are closed to us? Because the Caste Hindus treat us as Untouchables—as pariahs? If Caste temples are closed to us, we need not go to them: we have our own temples within ourselves: if the Caste-Hindus treat us as pariahs, they do so from ignorance, for in the eyes of the Lord we are all equal: if the Caste-Hindus will not touch us, why do we want them to touch us? It is not necessary for our physical well-being, or our spiritual salvation, that they should touch us! Besides, if physical contact with us were to pollute Caste-Hindus, would not the same contact purify us, extinguishing our 'untouchability' by that mere act of contact, thereby eliminating the bar that has divided us from the Caste-Hindus? We are prepared and would be happy to live with them as brothers on terms of equality and mutual co-operation, respect and regard. This, however, would be a social matter involving no question of religion. Our religion is our personal affair between our Lord and ourselves: we do not allow our Caste-Hindu brothers to have anything to do with it, as we do not want to have anything to do with their religion which is their personal affair between them and their God. So, then, *where* is the need for us to seek a 'new religion?' No, as I have observed above, the Lord has ordained that we should be born to Hindu parents—Avarna parents: let us be content to live and die as Hindus in the knowledge and conviction that though Avarna in the eyes of our Caste-Hindu brothers, in the eyes of our Lord we are as good as, and 'equal' to, our Caste brothers, with 'no differentiation' whatever between them and us. To those of us, therefore, who, through impatience, think of seeking relief in a 'new religion,' our answer would be, "Brothers, our present religion, such as we understand it and as we seek to practise it, is good enough for us: it will, we humbly believe, lead us to our Creator: so would any other religion do—it could do no more: may the Lord, therefore, grant us all patience and mutual understanding: the occasion, as you see it, for search for a 'new religion' will then have disappeared."

Our five crores of Untouchables have ages-long associations with Hinduism, and in their hearts yet worship Hinduism's gods whose temple doors continue to remain barred against them. The rank and file of these five crores may not be ready to sunder the associations of ages to seek their salvation along a new and untried path. In spite of all their disabilities and indignities, they may yet prefer to continue to knock at the barred temple doors in the hope that the deities within or their Sanatanist votaries without may some day hear the knocks—hear the cry of their hearts—may some day open those doors to them—to the RAM-TAJAIYAS—the Forsaken of God!

We may, or may not, agree with the Forecast of the Future of Caste given above, but there is a passage in it which to me appears to hold the key to the whole situation as it stands today. It says "The absolutely indispensable compromises with modern conditions will arrange themselves from time to time." Herein—in COMPROMISES—lies the key: the Khulna Mahasabha realised this. If all temples remain closed to our Untouchables, let there be a *special temple* for them everywhere, a Dharma Sabha, a *Public Temple*, where

the Untouchables could worship their deities without having to knock at closed doors. Time was when the Hindus could proudly assert

".....It is here in India that Hindus have built and are still building churches for Christians and mosques for Muhammadans..." (a)

Is it to be said that our Hindu fathers who built churches and mosques have no counterpart in their present day progeny? If Hindus could build churches for Christians and mosques for Muslims, is it to be said that they would not build temples for their own brothers in faith—Dharma Sabhas, Public Temples, for the Harijan-Hindus? *SPECIAL TEMPLES, not a Special Religion*, would seem to offer the solution of the Problem of the Untouchables in the sphere of religious worship.

Our Muslim Depressed Classes

When we hear or read of depressed and suppressed classes, we usually connect them with the Hindu community. Such classes, however, are not peculiar to the Hindus alone. It seems that class distinctions prevail among the Muslims as well, as will appear from the following extract from the *Indian Annual Register, 1938* :— (b)

"SOCIAL DISABILITIES IN MUSLIM SOCIETY—In the Muslim society in India also there are 'depressed' classes not in the sense in which the adjective is used in reference to Hindu society. The *Momins*, who claim to be half the Muslim population of India, have social disabilities which have demanded redress and removal in meetings and conferences held in the United Provinces, Bihar and Bengal. In the Bengalee-speaking districts of Sylhet, and Cachar, for administrative reasons included in the Province of Assam, there is a class of Muslims, known as *Maimals*, by occupation fishermen and boatmen, who have given organised expression through meetings and associations to the grievances caused by certain social disabilities. The higher classes in the Muslim community constituted by those whose ancestors came from outside India—the Sayyieds, Sheiks, Pathans and Moghuls—have conceits of superiority that are in no way less proved than those found in the heart of Hindu society. The late Khondkar Fazli Rubee, Dewan to the Nawab Bahadur of Murshidabad, descendant of the family from whose hands had slipped the sceptre of rule into the hands of Clive, in his book—*The Origin of the Mussalmans of Bengal*—gives us an idea of this equality and inequality:

'From a religious point of view, of course, all Mussalmans stand on a footing of equality. But according to usage and customs the social position and family rank of a man do not become altered by a change of religion..... a low caste person on his embracing Islam is not allowed to hold familiar intercourse with high-born Mussalmans..... Rigid and scrupulous regard has ever been paid by the Mussalmans to social and family dignity.'

The social democracy plea of Islam is not true to the facts of life as it is lived in Muslim society. Much is made of the equality that lines up the Nawab, the Muslim nobleman, with the Muslim porter in the Friday prayer in the mosque. The Hindus also, in Bengal at least, can show a similar habit of equality on the occasion of *kirtans*, devotional songs, when the

(a) Extract from a lecture entitled 'The Vedanta for the World' by Swami Vivekananda after his return from Chicago Parliament of Religions in 1897

(b) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1938, Vol. I, page

Brahmin and the Dome (an Avarna caste man) sit or stand side by side and sing songs to the glory and beneficence of the Lord, penetrated with the belief in His words uttered to Narada—"Where two or three men are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them." This equality on occasions is not potent enough to create that habit which is the bed-rock of the democracy which the modern times demand."

It would appear that just as the Hindus have their Avarna and Varna classes, their low and high castes, so have the Muslims their Momin and Shareef classes, their low and high classes; The All-India Momin Conference claims to represent 'the socially and economically depressed classes among the Indian Muslims.'

"The Superintendent of Census for 1941 for the Province of Bengal records the following interesting facts regarding the Muslims of Bengal:— (a)

The conventional division of the Mahomedans into four tribes—Sheikh, Saiad, Moghul and Pathan—has very little application to this Province (Bengal). The Mahomedans themselves recognise two main social divisions, (1) Ashraf or Sharaf and (2) Ajlaf. Ashraf means 'noble' and includes all undoubted descendants of foreigners and converts from high caste Hindus. All other Mahomedans including the occupational groups and all converts of lower ranks, are known by the contemptuous terms, 'Ajlaf', 'wretches' or 'mean people': they are also called Kamina or Itar, 'base' or Rasil, a corruption of Rizal, 'worthless'. In some places a third class, called Arzal or 'lowest of all' is added. With them no other Mahomedan would associate, and they are forbidden to enter the mosque or to use the public burial ground.

Within these groups there are castes with social precedence of exactly the same nature as one finds among the Hindus.

I.—*Ashraf*—or better class Mahomedans.

- (1) Saiads, (2) Sheikhs, (3) Pathans, (4) Moghul, (5) Mallik, and (6) Mirza.

II.—*Ajlaf*—or lower class Mahomedans.

- (1) Cultivating Sheikhs, and others who were originally Hindus but who do not belong to any functional group, and have not gained admittance to the Ashraf Community, e. g., Pirali and Thakrai.
- (2) Darzi, Johala, Fakir, and Rangrez.
- (3) Barhi, Bhathiara, Chik, Churihar, Dai, Dhawa, Dhunia, Gaddi, Kalal, Kasai, Kula Kunjara, Laheri, Mahifarosh, Mallah, Naliya, and Nikari.
- (4) Abdal, Bako, Bediya, Bhat, Chamba, Dafali, Dhobi, Hajjam, Mucho, Nagarchi, Nat, Panwaria, Madaria, and Tuntia.

III.—*Arzal*—or degraded class.

Bhanar, Halalkhor, Hijra, Kasbi, Lalbegi, Maugta, Mehtar.

The Census Superintendent mentions another feature of the Muslim Social System, namely, the prevalence of the 'panchayat' system: he states:—

"The authority of the panchayat extends to social as well as trade matters and—.....marriage with people of other communities is one of the

offences of which the governing body takes cognizance. The result is that these groups are often as strictly endogamous as Hindu castes. The prohibition on inter-marriage extends to higher as well as to lower castes, and a Dhuma, for example, may marry no one but a Dhuma. If this rule is transgressed, the offender is at once hauled up before the panchayat and ejected ignominiously from his community. A member of one such group cannot ordinarily gain admission to another, and he retains the designation of the community in which he was born even if he abandons its distinctive occupation and takes to other means of livelihood.....thousands of Jolahas are butchers, yet they are still known as Jolahas."

Similar facts from other Provinces of India could be gathered from their respective Census Reports and those who are curious may refer to them. But the facts for Bengal are enough to show that the Mahomedans observe not only caste but also untouchability. There can thus be no manner of doubt that the Muslim Society in India is afflicted by the same social evils which afflict the Hindu Society. Indeed the Muslims have all the social evils of the Hindus....."

The Malechhas

There is yet another aspect of the Untouchability Question. Since the invasion of India by the Musalmans, the term has been applied by the Hindus to the Muslim invaders whom they classed along with the Shudras, the Untouchables. The Hindus feel polluted by the touch of the Muslims: to the Muslim the Hindu is a pagan, therefore polluted, whose touch would pollute a Muslim who is pure in body and soul. (a) This attitude of mutual repulsion has persisted through the centuries, and is today one of the main obstacles in the path of evolving communal and political unity between the Hindus and the Muslims.

The Problem

The depressed and suppressed classes, both Hindu and Muslim, have now become vocal: they have realised the strength that is inherent in their numbers—it is claimed that there are as many depressed class Muslims as there are higher class ones, and one Hindu Untouchable to every four Caste-Hindus—they have realised the strength that association brings. They feel that so long as their social disabilities persisted, it would be suicidal for them to support their respective higher classes in securing political power in the Country. Therefore, the Hindu Untouchables are opposed to the transference of political power to Indians on the basis of democracy with its rule by majority, which would mean rule by the Hindu majority, which would mean rule by the Caste-Hindus involving for the non-Caste Hindus the perpetuation of their degraded state. Therefore, the Depressed Muslims—the Momins, the Maimals, etc.—are opposed to Pakistan being secured by the Muslims, as they feel that Pakistan would mean for them the perpetuation of their degraded state.

Our British Rulers have accurately gauged the situation and sensed its possibilities. They have played the Harijans against the Caste-Hindus, e.g., the Communal Award! They have played the Momins against Mr. Jinnah's League and Pakistan!

Thus the Depressed Classes, which not long ago were a purely communal problem, have now become also a political problem.

It will have been observed that THE POLITICAL PROBLEM AT ITS ROOTS IS THE OLD COMMUNAL PROBLEM—THE PROBLEM OF RELIGIOUS, SOCIAL, AND ECONOMIC DISABILITIES AND INEQUALITIES. THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM WOULD THUS LIE IN THE REMOVAL OF THESE DISABILITIES AND INEQUALITIES.

As regards the question of **religious disabilities**, fortunately it is restricted to the Hindus alone. Islam permits no distinction in the matter of religion between one faithful and another. In the mosque, or on the Idgah, a fakir may rub shoulders with an amir without any question being asked. Among the Hindus also, in the eyes of the Lord, all devotees are equal: He makes no differentiation between them on the score of caste: in fact, as has been recorded above, in Bengal, even today, the Brahmin and the Dome (an Avarna caste Hindu) may be found sitting or standing side by side at kirtans, etc., singing songs to the glory of the Lord. The differentiation, the disabilities, in the matter of religious observances are not of His making: He has not enjoined the closing of temple doors against some of His devotees while throwing them open to others: He does not even want any temples whatever: in fact as the Lord told Narada, wherever two or three men are gathered together in His name, He is there in the midst of them, whoever they may be, whether Caste or non-Caste Hindus. This disability imposed upon the Untouchables in the matter of religious observances has been the creation of the Caste Hindus, and its removal, therefore, lies with them. The way to such removal has been indicated in the Bengal Provincial Hindu Mahasabha's resolution at Khulna referred to earlier in this chapter. *Dharma Sabhas*, *Public Temples*, appear to hold the prospect of going a long way towards the removal of this disability, and the establishment of such *Dharma Sabhas*, such *Public Temples*, must be deemed to be one of the first steps, if not the first step, required for the solution of the Problem of Hindu Untouchability. As to the question how such public temples are to be brought into existence and maintained, it may be observed that since the necessity for such temples has arisen entirely from the treatment, or rather the mal-treatment, of the Avarnas by the Caste-Hindus, the cost involved in establishing and maintaining such temples should in equity be borne by the Caste-Hindus of the locality: while the local Harijans may be free to contribute towards the cost, the duty of finding the requisite funds should be accepted by the Caste-Hindus for the benefit of their own souls as an expiation for the wrong done to the sufferers through the ages.

Next in importance would come the **social disabilities** from which the Hindu Untouchables have been suffering. Here is a vast field for the social reformer. While we may not hope for a sudden and wholesale transformation in the mental outfit and outlook in the older generations of Sanatanists vis-a-vis the Avarnas, while we may not expect them to embrace the Avarnas, to inter-dine and inter-marry with the Avarnas, our reformers would find ample scope among the younger generations who might not be so hide-bound by dogmas and rituals and who would be capable of appreciating the existing injustices. The resolution adopted by the All-India Women's Conference in December 1940 quoted earlier in this chapter indicates some of the directions which offer scope for useful work. Such efforts to be fruitful would have to be undertaken on a country-wide scale: we would require a reformer, a conscientious worker, in every village, in every street of every town, in every Muslim and Hindu home. In the chapter addressed to Our Youth I have asked them to become, every one of them, a missionary in the cause of Communal Unity and to carry its message to every home. The attainment of inter-caste and inter-class equality, which would be the *sine qua non* of the Problem of the Removal of Untouchability, would be identifiable with

MAY THE LORD FORGIVE US.

CHAPTER IV

COMMUNAL UNITY—SUGGESTIONS.

The All-India Unity Conference, 1924

In September 1924 an All-India Unity Conference was held at Delhi attended by Hindus, Muslims, Parsees, Sikhs and Christians, many Europeans being among those present including the Metropolitan of India. The following is a summary of the resolution adopted by the Conference as laying down the basis upon which the problem of communal dissensions might be approached. The summary and the comments following it appear at pages 321-23 of 'INDIA IN 1924-25' by Prof. Rushbrook Williams.

Summary—

These resolutions proclaimed it to be improper for any person who considered his religious feelings affronted to take the law into his own hands. All differences should be referred to arbitration, and failing that to courts. The universal toleration of religious beliefs, and freedom of expression and practice, with due regard to the feelings of others, was proclaimed. Upon the crucial question of cow-killing a resolution was passed admonishing the Hindus of the impossibility of stopping the practice by force alone. Muhammadans were advised to exercise their rights with as little offence to the Hindus as possible; while the Musalman Leaders of the Conference personally pledged themselves to do everything in their power to reduce the number of cows annually slaughtered. Other resolutions discouraged the practice of disturbing rival communities by music, calling to prayer, and the like, without regard to conflicting susceptibilities. The Conference also established an All-India Pan-hayat of 15 persons, including Christians and Sikhs as well as Hindus and Muhammadans, whose task it was to appoint local Panchayats for the purpose of conciliation between the two communities.

Comments—

Unfortunately, the Unity Conference has produced little practical result and the All-India Panchayat seems still-born. This, however regrettable, is hardly surprising. The atmosphere amidst which the deliberations were conducted was ill-suited to any clear-cut remedy for the Hindu-Musalman problem. It seems difficult, however, to deny that the solution of this vexed question must ultimately lie along the lines laid down at the Delhi Conference. Meanwhile, Government themselves had not been idle. It is the everyday endeavour of the administration, as has been pointed out elsewhere, to maintain a working understanding between the two communities such as will operate to prevent riots and disturbances. But despite the best efforts of the authorities, the fact remains that in India, communal disturbances represent an imminent peril against which no degree of vigilance and foresight can effectively provide. No measures, whether legislative or executive, can be expected to produce any immediate effect on the ancient and deep-rooted causes of these troubles, which are only to be removed by the slow and painful evolution of a spirit of toleration and enlightenment.

Communal Unity—As Viewed By The All-India Women's Conference

Extract from the presidential address of Shrimati Rameshwari Nehru at the All-India Women's Conference, at Bangalore, 27/30th December, 1940 :—

"COMMUNAL UNITY is another allied chosen subject of the year. Its achievement for our national advance is as fundamental as the removal of Untouchability. If anything, it is perhaps more acute and requires more delicate handling. It is a mixture of political, economic and religious elements made complex and difficult of solution by the presence of a third and interested party. But we may not put the blame on the third party and seek absolution of responsibility of ourselves. The very fact that the third party succeeds in creating or augmenting schism amongst us shows our weakness. For the removal of that weakness, ways and means must be found. The Women's Conference has done a considerable amount to bring the women of all communities on a common platform. I can vouch for the fact that amongst us there are no distinctions of caste or creed. We do not even remember which religion or community we belong to. On the platform of the Conference we are just women serving the cause of women and the motherland. But we have not yet been able to take this amity and goodwill further than the boundaries of our Conference. We ought to make an effort to do this. One point which I would like to bring to the notice of the delegates is that the number of our Muslim members and delegates is very small. Great attention should be paid to increase their number and I request my Muslim sister delegates to make it their special concern for the next year. Without their earnest co-operation this work cannot be accomplished. The end of the year must show a large increase of Muslim members on our registers. That in itself will bring the two sister communities a step nearer." (a)

The Conference adopted the report on COMMUNAL UNITY submitted by the Group Conference which met on the 28th December 1940 for the purpose. The report viewed, with the utmost distress, the lack of communal harmony which was eating into the vitals of national life and urged on all women to make a contribution which was theirs by nature and bring concord where discord now prevailed. The report urged that no government or municipal aid in future should be given to communal institutions and appealed to the newspapers to do their best not to indulge in communal propaganda.

The Conference viewed with the utmost distress the forces of communal discord which "are disintegrating the national life", and called upon the women of India "to make a special contribution to the rebuilding of society upon permanent foundations of co-operation and goodwill and peace". (b)

If People are to Live Happily Together —

"If people are to live happily together, they must not fancy, because they are thrown together now, that all their lives have been exactly similar upto the present time, that they started exactly alike, and that they are to be for the future of the same mind. A thorough conviction of the difference of men is the great thing to be assured of in social knowledge: it is to life what Newton's law is to astronomy. Sometimes men have a knowledge of it with regard to the world in general: they do not expect the outer world to agree with them in all points, but are vexed at not being able to drive their own tastes and opinions into those

(a) INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1940, Vol. II, page 335.

(b) " " " " " " 338-39.

they live with. Diversities distress them. They will not see that there are many forms of virtue and wisdom. Yet we might as well say, "Why all these stars; why this difference; why not all one star?"

Many of the rules for people living together in peace follow from the above. For instance, not to interfere unreasonably with others, not to ridicule their tastes, not to question and re-question their resolves, not to indulge in perpetual comment on their proceedings, and to delight in their having other pursuits than ours, are all based upon a thorough perception of the simple fact that they are not we.

Another rule for living happily with others is to avoid having stock subjects of disputation. It mostly happens, when people live much together, that they come to have certain set topics, around which from frequent dispute, there is such a growth of angry words, mortified vanity, and the like, that the original subject of difference becomes a standing subject for quarrel: and there is a tendency in all minor disputes to drift down to it.

Again, if people wish to live well together, they must not hold too much to logic, and suppose that everything is to be settled by sufficient reason..... There is no time for such reasonings, and nothing that is worth them. And when we recollect how two lawyers, or two politicians, can go on contending, and that there is no end of one-sided reasoning on any subject, we shall not be sure that such contention is the best mode for arriving at truth. But certainly it is not the way to arrive at good temper..

If you would be loved as a companion, avoid unnecessary criticism upon those with whom you live.... Now it would be hard for a man to live with another who was always criticising his actions, even if it were kindly and just criticism. It would be like living between the glasses of a microscope..... You may say more truth, or rather speak out more plainly, to your associates, but not less courteously than you do to strangers.

We must not expect more from the society of our friends and companions, than it can give, and especially must not expect contrary things.....

Lastly, in conciliating those we live with, it is most surely done, not by consulting their interests, nor by giving way to their opinions, so much as by not offending their tastes." (a)

*

*

*

Some Points of Difference Between the Communities

In Sections (ix) and (x) of Part III, Chapter 2, "The Communities in the Present," we have noted the Muslim League's Charges against the Congress governments and the Hindu Mahasabha's Charges against the Muslim governments. It will be seen that these charges and counter-charges follow the lines of the communal differences, and may be summarised as under:—

(1) The Cow Question—

The Hindus demand that the State should prohibit cow slaughter on the grounds

- (a) that it hurts the religious feelings of the Hindus; and
- (b) that from the economic point of view it is essential that the State should adopt measures to encourage cattle husbandry..

(a) Extract from "FRIENDS IN COUNCIL," by Sir Arthur Helps, in GREAT ESSAYS OF ALL NATIONS, pages 252-56.

The Muslims contend that cow sacrifice is enjoined by their religion, and they will not tolerate any attempt to interfere with their age-old religious rites and practices.

(2) The Azan—

The Muslim Call to Prayers.

The Charge against the Hindus is that they have attempted to stop this custom in some of the Congress-governed provinces: the Muslims contend that the practice dated from the days of their Holy Prophet, and attempts to stop it would amount to interference with their religious practices:

The Hindu contention appears to be that such calls in Hindu localities hurt their religious susceptibilities.

(3) Music Before Mosques—

The charge against the Hindus is that they deliberately play music when passing by mosques in processions, etc., thereby causing disturbance to the Muslims engaged in prayers inside the mosques.

The Hindu contention is that they only follow long-established local practice which was not objected to in the past, and that attempts to stop the practice would amount to interference with their religious rites and practices.

(4) The Language Question—

The Muslim charge is that in the Congress-governed provinces attempts were made to supplant the Urdu language by the Hindi language as the official language which, if allowed unopposed, would eventually result in Hindu-ising the Muslim youth:

The charge by the Hindus, on the other hand, is that the Muslims in the Muslim-governed provinces attempted to supplant Hindi by Urdu with like apprehended results!

(5) The National Anthem for India—

The Congress governments had adopted the Bande Matram song as the National Anthem for India. The Muslims contend that the song is detrimental to Muslim nationalism, and object to its being sung in mixed gatherings, schools, etc., where Muslims may be present.

(6) The National Flag for India—

In the Congress-governed provinces the Congress tri-colour flag was used as the National Flag of India. The Muslims refuse to accept it as such, and have countered it with a flag of their own.

(7) Social Intercourse—

The Muslim charge against the Hindus is that the latter treat them socially as Untouchables (Mushkars), with consequent segregation.

The Muslims retaliate by advocating boycott of Hindu shops and extension of like treatment to the Hindus as they do to the Muslims.

The above are the main points of difference, but the list is by no means exhaustive.

Section (i) — THE COW QUESTION

The Hindu Viewpoint

there came a beautiful shining prince, who was named 'Prithu,' and reigned in the place of his father. Now during his reign there was a terrible famine. As the earth would not yield her fruits, great distress prevailed. Prithu said, 'I will slay the Earth, and make her yield her fruits.' Terrified at this threat, the Earth assumed the form of a cow, and was pursued by Prithu, even to the heaven of Brahma. At length, weary with the chase, she turned to him and said, 'Know you not the sin of killing a female, that you thus try to slay me?' The king replied that, 'when the happiness of many is secured by the destruction of one malignant being, the slaughter of that being is an act of virtue.' 'But', said the Earth, 'if in order to promote the welfare of your subjects, you put an end to me, whence, best of monarchs, will thy people derive their support?' Overcome at length, the Earth declared that all vegetable products were old, and destroyed by her, but that at the king's command she would restore them 'as developed from her milk.' 'Do you, therefore, for the benefit of mankind, give me that calf by which I may be able to secrete milk. Make also all places level, so that I may cause my milk, the seed of all vegetation, to flow everywhere around.'

Prithu acted upon this advice. Before his time, there was no cultivation, no pasture, no agriculture, no highways for merchants: all these things (or all civilisation) originated in the reign of Prithu. Where the ground was made level, the king induced his subjects to take up their abode, He therefore having made Swayambhuya Manu the calf, milked the Earth, and received the milk into his own hand, for the benefit of mankind. Thence proceeded all kinds of corn and vegetables upon which people now subsist. By granting life to the Earth Prithu was as her father and she thence derived the patronymic appellation 'Prithvi.'

* * *

* * *

* * *

* * *

[illegible]

was forbidden; whereas the 'Artha-sastra' (Book II, chap. 26) contains the clause:

'Cattle such as a calf, a bull, or a milch cow shall not be slaughtered.' (a)

*

*

*

The Congress approach to the question

"As regards Cow Slaughter, there has been a great deal of entirely false and unfounded propaganda against the Congress suggesting that the Congress was going to stop it forcibly by legislation. The Congress does not wish to undertake any legislative action in the matter to restrict the established rights of the Muslims." (b)

*

*

*

The attitude of the Hindu Mahasabha

Resolution No. XIII adopted at the Sessions of the Mahasabha held in December, 1938:—

"(a) The Hindu Mahasabha is emphatically of the opinion that considering the religious sentiments and susceptibilities of the Hindus with regard to cow and also in view of the requirements of their prosperous husbandry, it should be the primary duty of the State to protect cows.

(b) The Mahasabha hereby requests the Government of the United Provinces to take immediate steps to stop at once the slaughter of cows in or near about Mathura—it being a holy city of the Hindus, any cow slaughter-house maintained deliberately in its vicinity cannot but be looked upon as a standing insult to the whole of the Hindu Nation.

(c) That the question of Satyagraha at Mathura should be referred to the U-P. Provincial Hindu Sabha for necessary action." (c)

*

*

*

The following resolution was passed at the meeting of the Working Committee of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha at New Delhi on 18/19th January, 1941:—

"The Hindu Mahasabha views with alarm the tendency disclosed in the recent communal riots in various provinces such as Bihar, United Provinces, Bengal and others on the occasion of the Id Festival on the part of Muslims to perform cow sacrifice in Hindu localities in order to offend and hurt their religious feelings. The Working Committee of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha hereby points out to the Government that time has come when the authorities in charge of Law and Order should suppress these provocative and mischievous activities of the Muslims with strong hand." (d)

The following resolution was passed at the sessions of the U. P. Hindu Conference at Allahabad held on the 15th April, 1941:—

"The Hindu Conference abhors with indignation the prevalence of cow slaughter in India and requests the U. P. Government to adopt immediate

- (a) "THE OXFORD HISTORY OF INDIA" by Vincent A. Smith, C.I.E., page 102.
- (b) Pundit Nehru's letter to Mr. Jinnah, dated 6-4-38, I. A. R., 1938, Vol. I Pp. 369-70.
- (c) I. A. R. 1938 Vol. II, p. 339.
- (d) " " 1941 Vol. I, p. 281.

measures for its prevention as it against the religious susceptibilities of the Hindus and is detrimental to the economic progress of the country." (a)

The Muslim Viewpoint

The following letter written by a young Muslim friend and reproduced as received shows how the question of Cow Sacrifice is viewed by the average Muslim Man in the Street:—

"The cow sacrifice along with other animals came into existence in the days of Prophet Ibrahim who is the forerunner of all the Prophets sent by God on earth. But as the time passed, so many new customs took place among the peoples of the Prophets as we see as to how the Western Customs and Creeds have over-taken us. So it is a related fact that during the rule of the Egyptian Kings called the 'Firraon,' the Queen of the King died leaving behind her a new born boy to be crowned king of Egypt. When the boy grew older he asked his father about his mother. The father told him that cow was his mother on whose milk he was nourished. (So now the cow begins to be the nourisher of the Prince). So the respecting of cow began and in third or fourth generation of the dynasty of the 'Firraons' the Rulers of Egypt, it got far and wide popularity and the people little thinking of the original fact adopted the cow-worship forgetting the existence of the real God. Moreover the Egyptian King found the blindness of his people and so he took that opportunity and began discouraging his people towards their real God and claimed himself to be the God, and cow the deity of worship.

It has remained the practice of God that when He sees that peoples have turned away from Him He sends His Messenger or Reformer to earth. So He sent Moosa or Moses to explain to the people the oneness of God and leave that cow-worship. Moosa told his people the fact received from God but the cow-worship belief had settled in their hearts. So God commanded Moosa to get one cow killed by his people, which he told his people, on which they made certain questions regarding her colour, and age, etc., which Moosa satisfied, so they killed a cow and the belief entertained by them vanished. But such people were few in number with Moosa and the majority was with 'Firraon,' and there a battle took place between Moosa and 'Firraon' in which 'Firraon' was defeated and his people ran away.

How cow-worship came into India.—The followers of 'Firraon' when they saw that their Master was killed and there was no protection for them, they started emigration and they came to Central Asia and therefrom they came to India. When they came to India they saw the original inhabitants of India putting up in holes underground worshipping snakes and evil spirits. These new emigrants were more civilised and artful and soon brought the original inhabitants of India in their influence. So the cow-worship in India also started. We still see the original inhabitants of India with names of Bhils, Dheds who remained as they were and did not take to the cow-worship.

Now the question remains whether it is necessary to offer the cow-sacrifice still. Yes. As a rule when any Government issues or passes any act, it cannot be disobeyed till some other new act is passed which repeals it. Similarly it was an Act passed by God, it cannot cease to come into force until some other command is sent by God to repeal it. So it will continue to function its powers."

The following two extracts are from another esteemed Muslim friend, advanced in years, who has studied the Holy Quran and Hadis:

"If you will look into Sura Al Hajj, i. e., Chapter 22, of the Holy Quran, you will find that cattle quadrupeds are mentioned in verse 34, and in verse 36 camel is included because otherwise camel not being cattle would not have been allowed. Further details are given in Hadith books. These allowed animals are slaughtered 'to eat and to feed the poor.' If a goat or sheep is slaughtered, it is sufficient for a family—one household—according to Hadith Nabavi. In case of a cow or camel, several persons can be partners. It is not a sacrifice in the sense in which animal sacrifices are offered to deys and devis (Hindu gods and goddesses). It is not offering to God also in the sense it is done in some other religions. See ch. 22, verse 37. But the slaughter should be in the prescribed manner and the name of Allah should be invoked. See ch. 6, verse 122."

"With regard to the further enquiry on the subject, if you will look into Sura Al Hajj, ch. 22 of the Holy Quran, you will find in verse 34 the words used for the animals allowable on the day of the Idd 'Bahimatul Anaam.' If you will look into any Arabic Lexicon, you will find the words Bahimatul Anaam is a collective noun for the bovine pasturing animals, i. e., cattle, and this collective noun includes sheep, goat, ox, and cow. The name Bahimatul Anaam consists of two words of which I give you the meaning hereunder:—

- (1) Bahima—means bovine animal or cattle or quadrupeds which includes sheep, goat, cow, etc.
- (2) Anaam—means such of the pasturing animals as are allowed to be eaten or enjoyed.

This Bahimatul Anaam is a collective noun equivalent to *Mal*. Therefore there was no necessity to name either sheep, goat, or cow, separately. In verse 36 of the same Sura camels are mentioned in order to include camels, otherwise camels would not have been among the allowable animals as they are not generally included among the pasturing cattle. If it is contended that cow is not included among the allowable animals, as cow is not specifically mentioned in the Sura, then one can also contend that neither sheep nor goat is also allowable because they are also not specifically mentioned in the Sura.

In the Holy Quran you will find in many places such collective phrases and names, as the Holy Quran is not expected to give minute details. Therefore for details we have to look to the Hadith, that is to say, the sayings and practice of the Holy Prophet during his life-time. There are many Hadith Books written after the death of the Holy Prophet, and if you will go into the details given in all these, you will find the details are unanimous in including the cow."

The following Verses from the Holy Qur'an, and their Translation and Notes have been taken from "THE HOLY QUR'AN, Text, Translation and Commentary," by Abdullah Yusuf Ali:—

S U R A—XXII—H A J J

قرآن شریف سے حوالہ

- (a)
28. That they may witness
The benefits (provided) for them
And celebrate the name
Of God, through the days (2801)
Appointed, over the cattle (2802)
Which He has provided for them
(For sacrifice): then eat ye
Thereof and feed the distressed
Ones in want.

(۲۲) سُورَةُ الْحَجِّ مَدِينَةُ هـ
بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
لَيَشْهَدُوا مَنَافِعَ لَهُمْ
وَيَذْكُرُوا اسْمَ اللَّهِ فِي أَيَّامٍ مَّعْلُومَاتٍ
عَلَىٰ مَا رَزَقَهُمْ مِنْ بَهِيمَةِ الْأَنْعَامِ
فَكُلُوا مِنْهَا وَأَطْعِمُوا الْبَائِسَ الْفَقِيرَ

S U R A—XXII—H A J J

32. Such (is his state): but
If any wish to give more
(Animals than usual for sacrifice).
By way of symbols to God,
They would come truly
From the piety
Of their hearts.

قرآن شریف سے حوالہ

(۲۲) سُورَةُ الْحَجِّ مَدِينَةُ هـ

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
ذَٰلِكَ نَفَعٌ لِّمَنِ يُعْطِيهِمْ شَعَائِرَ اللَّهِ
فَإِنَّهَا مِنْ تَقْوَىٰ الْقُلُوبِ هـ

S U R A—XXII—H A J J

قرآن شریف سے حوالہ

(2803)

33. In them ye have benefits.
For a term appointed:
In the end their place
Of sacrifice is near
The ancient House.

(۲۲) سُورَةُ الْحَجِّ مَدِينَةُ هـ

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

لَكُمْ فِيهَا مَنَافِعُ إِلَىٰ أَجَلٍ مُّسَمًّى
لَّسْمَ حِلِّهَا إِلَى الْبَيْتِ الْعَتِيقِ

(a). —Men who go on pilgrimage.

(2801)—The three special days of Hajj are the 8th, 9th and 10th of the month of Zul-Hajj and the two or three subsequent days of Tashriq: but we may ordinarily include the first ten days of Zul-Hajj in the term.

(2802)—The great day of commemorative Sacrifice (Id-ul-Adha) is the tenth of Zul-Hajj: the meat then killed is meant to be eaten for food and distributed to the poor and needy. In present conditions, where much of it is wasted on the spot, it would be a good thing if the surplus meat were canned and utilised for export, or if the sacrifice were performed in some other form approved by due authority.

(2808) In them—in cattle, or animals offered for sacrifice. It is quite true that they are useful in many ways to men, e. g. camels in desert countries are useful as mounts or for carrying burdens, or for giving milk, and so for horses and oxen, and camels and oxen are also good for meat, and camel's hair can be woven into cloth: goats and sheep also yield milk and meat, and hair and wool. But if they are used for sacrifice, they become symbols by which men show that they are willing to give up some of their benefits for the sake of satisfying the needs of their poorer brethren.

(THE HOLY QUR'AN, Text, Translation and Commentary by Abdullah Yusuf Ali 1938 pp. 857-861).

S U R A—XXII—H A J J

34. *To every people did we
Appoint rites (of sacrifice),
That they might celebrate
The name of God over
The sustenance He gave them
From animals (fit for food) (2810)
But your God is One God:
Submit then your wills to him
(In Islam): and give thou
The good news (2811) to those
Who humble themselves,—*

قرآن شریف سے حوالہ:
(۳۳) سورۃ الحجۃ مدینہ:

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ
وَإِکْلَ أَمْتِهِ جَعَلْنَا مَنَسَكًا
لِّیَذْكُرُوا الشَّمْلَ اللّٰهَ عَلٰی مَا رَزَقَهُمْ
مِّنْ بَهِیْمَةِ الْاَنْعَامِ
فَالْهَکْمُ اِلَهِ وَاحِدٌ فَلَهُ اَسْلِمُوْا
وَلَبَّیْهُمُ الْخُسُوعُ

S U R A—XXII—H A J J

35. *To those whose hearts,
When God is mentioned,
Are filled with fear,
Who show patient perseverance
Over their afflictions, keep up
Regular prayer, and spend
(In charity) out of what
We have bestowed upon them.*

قرآن شریف سے حوالہ:
(۳۴) سورۃ الحجۃ مدینہ:

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ
الَّذِیْنَ اِذَا ذُکِرَ اللّٰهُ وَجِلَتْ قُلُوْبُهُمْ
وَالصّٰدِقِیْنَ عَلٰی مَا اٰصَابَهُمْ
وَالْمُقِیْمِیْنَ الصَّلٰوٰةَ
وَمِمَّا اَرْسَلْنَاهُمْ یُفِیْقُوْنَ

(2810)—This is the true end of sacrifice, not propitiation of higher powers, for God is One and He does not delight in flesh and blood (XXII—37), but a symbol of thanksgiving to God by sharing meat with fellow-men. The solemn pronouncement of God's name over the sacrifice is an essential part of the rite.

(2811)—The good news: i. e., the Message of God, that He will accept in us the sacrifice of self for the benefit of our fellow-men.

S U R A—XXII—H A J J

36. *The sacrificial camels*
We have made for you
As among the Symbols from
God: in them is (much)
Good for you: then pronounce
The name of God over them
As they line up (for sacrifice):
When they are down
On their sides (after slaughter),
Eat ye thereof, and feed
Such as (beg not but)
Receive gifts with gratitude,
And such as beg
With due humility: thus have
We made animals subject
To you, that ye
May be grateful.

قرآن شریف سے حوالہ
 سورۃ الحج مدینہ
 بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ
 ۳۶۔ وَالْبَدْنَ جَعَلْنَاهَا لَكُمْ
 مِنْ شَعَائِرِ اللّٰهِ۔
 لَكُمْ فِيْهَا خَيْرٌ
 فَذَكِّرُوْا اَسْمَ اللّٰهِ عَلَیْهَا صَوَافٍ
 فَاِذَا وَجَبَتْ جُنُوْبُهَا
 فَكُلُوْا مِنْهَا وَاَطْعِمُوْا
 الْفَقَایِعَ وَالْمُعْتَزَّهَ كَذٰلِكَ
 سَقَرْنَاهَا لَكُمْ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَشْكُرُوْنَ ۝

S U R A—XXII—H A J J

37. *It is not their meat*
Nor their blood, that reaches
God: it is your piety
That reaches Him: He
Has thus made subject
To you, that ye may (2815)
Glorify God for His guidance:
And proclaim the Good News
To all who do right.

قرآن شریف سے حوالہ
 سورۃ الحج مدینہ
 بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ
 ۳۷۔ لَنْ یَّبَالَ اللّٰهُ لَهْوُهَا وَاِلَادِ مَا وُهِیَا
 وَلَکِنْ یَّتَالُہُ التَّقْوٰی مِنْکُمْ۔
 کَذٰلِکَ اَلَّکُمْ سَقَرْنَاهَا لَكُمْ
 لِتُذَكِّرُوْا اللّٰہَ عَلٰی مَا هَدٰکُمْ وَبَشِّرِ الْمُحْسِنِیْنَ ۝

(2815) -- The essence of sacrifice has been explained in Note 2810. No one should suppose that meat or blood is acceptable to the One True God. It was a pagan fancy that God could be appeased by blood sacrifice. But God does accept the offering of our hearts and as a symbol of such offer, some visible institution is necessary. He has given us power over the brute creation, and permitted us to eat meat, but only if we pronounce His name at the solemn act of taking life, for without this solemn invocation, we are apt to forget the sacredness of life. By the invocation we are reminded that wanton cruelty is not in our thoughts, but only the need of food. Now if we further deny ourselves the greater part of the food (some theologians fix the proportion at three-quarters or two-thirds) for the sake of our poorer brethren in solemn assembly in the precincts of the Haram (sacred territory), our symbolic act finds practical expression in benevolence, and that is the virtue sought to be taught. We should be grateful to God, for His guidance in this matter, in which many Peoples have gone wrong, and we should proclaim the true doctrine, so that virtue and charity may increase among men.

(THE HOLY QUR'AN, Text, Translation and Commentary by Abdullah Yusuf Ali, 1938).

is as follows. The animal must first be deprived of its food for a day or two that it may be rendered hungry, and having then covered the eye that is impaired, food must be gradually brought towards it from a distance, until it indicates by some emotion that it has discovered it. Having marked the particular spot at which it observed the food, and uncovered the weak eye, the perfect eye must then be bound, and the same process carried on, until it indicates that it has observed it with the defective eye. If, then, the particular distance from those parts to where the animal stood be measured, it may be known, from the proportion they bear to each other, in what degree the sight is impaired.

It is not lawful to offer a sacrifice of any animal except a camel, a cow, or a goat; for it is not recorded that the Prophet, or any of his Companions, ever sacrificed others. Buffaloes, however, are lawful as being of the species of a cow. Every animal of a mixed breed, moreover, is considered as of the same species with the mother.

If a Christian or any person whose object is the flesh, and not the sacrifice, be a sharer with six others, the sacrifice is lawful on the part of any. It is lawful for a person who offers a sacrifice either to eat the flesh or to bestow it on whomsoever he pleases, whether rich or poor, and, he may also lay it up in store. It is most advisable that the third part of the flesh of a sacrifice be bestowed in charity. It is not lawful to give a part of the sacrifice in payment to the butcher. It is abominable to take the wool of the victim and sell it before the sacrifice be performed, but not after the sacrifice. In the same manner, it is abominable to milk the victim and sell the milk. It is most advisable that the person who offers the sacrifice should himself perform it, provided he be well acquainted with the method, but if he should not be expert at it, it is then advisable that he take the assistance of another, and be present at the operation. It is abominable to commit the slaying of the victim to a Kitabi (a Jew or Christian). If, however, a person order a Kitabi to slay his victim, it is lawful. It is otherwise where a person orders a Magian, or worshipper of fire, to slay his victim, for this is inadmissible. (Hamilton's *Hidayah*, vol. iv, p. 76).

(5) From the foregoing references to the Qur'an, the Traditions, Abdu'l-Haqq, al-Baizawi, it will appear that whilst the Muhammadan sacrifice is (1) *Commemorative* having been instituted in commemoration of Abraham's willingness to offer his son; (2) *Self-Dedicatory*, as expressed in the Traditional saying of Muhammad; and (3) *Eucharistic*, according to the verse in the Qur'an already quoted, 'Haply ye may give thanks'; that the expiatory character of the sacrifice is not clearly established, for there is no offering for, or acknowledgment of, sin, connected with the institution. Muhammadanism, true to its anti-Christian character, ignores the doctrine that "Without shedding of blood there is no remission" (Lev. xviii; Heb. ix, 22).

(6) At the birth of a child it is incumbent upon the Muslim father to sacrifice a goat (one for a girl and two for a boy) at the ceremony called 'Aqiqah,' which is celebrated on either the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, twenty-eighth, or thirty-fifth day after birth, when the hair is first shaved and its weight in silver given to the poor. 'Abdu'l-Haqq says 'Aqiqah' comes from 'aqq' 'to cut' and refers to cutting

the throat of the animal. Others refer it to cutting the hair. The idea of the sacrifice on this occasion is dedicatory and eucharistic. Buraidah says, "we used, in the time of ignorance, when children were born to us, to slay, sheep and rub the child's head with the blood; but when Islam came we sacrificed a sheep on the seventh day, and shaved the child's head and rubbed saffron on it."

The following extract from the *DABISTAN*, (Translation by David Shea and Anthony Truycer), Vol. III, page 94, will be found to be of interest showing as it does that Akbar the Great "forbade his subjects to kill cows and to eat their flesh" because medical men had declared that cow's flesh "causes itch, dry scab, leprosy, elephantiasis, and the like diseases, and is difficult to digest" :—

"His Majesty, Akbar, as he was ordered by God, used to read prayers, containing the praise of the sun, in the Persian, Hindi, Turkish, and Arabic languages, among which all was one prayer which is proper to the Hindus, and which they sing at midnight and at sun-rise. Besides, the emperor forbade his subjects to kill cows and to eat their flesh; because medical men have declared that cow's flesh causes itch, dry scab, leprosy, elephantiasis, and the like diseases, and is difficult to digest. The Hindus say also that, as many advantages are derived from the cow, it is not right to kill it. The Yezdanian maintained that it is tyranny to kill harmless animals, and a tyrant is an enemy of God, the Almighty. But the learned of the time showed in the book 'Serat ul Mustakim,' 'The Right Road,' composed by the Imam Majeddin Muhammed, son of Yakub, son of Muhammed, Firozabadi, that what is known

'the most excellent meat of both the worlds is flesh.' This has not been firmly established, and in the subject of the excellence of 'hershah,' a kind of pottage, nothing appeared, nor on the subject of the virtues of the white cock; and on the subject of bastards it is known:

'the illegitimate son has no access to paradise.' (a) This was not firmly established, and is futile. His Majesty the Khalifah of the all-just, proclaimed himself the joyous tidings, that cows ought not to be killed."

The following couplet is traceable to *أبا موسى مشعري* (aba Musa Mash'ari), a contemporary of the Holy Prophet of Arabia

لحم البقر داءٌ وحليبها دواءٌ
وركوبها هضمٌ

"The Cow's flesh causes disease, its sweet milk-fresh from the udder—is a healing (having medicinal property) and its ride is a means of digestion."

Some Suggestions

From the fore-going extracts it appears to be clear and beyond a doubt that animal sacrifice is enjoined on the Faithful by Islam: in fact, the Holy Prophet of Islam, on the occasions recorded, performed the sacrificial rite with his own hand. The extracts give instructions as to what animals may be offered as sacrifice,

(a) The Translator's note—"I am not acquainted with the subjects above alluded to, nor does the text appear to be connected."

Note.—For the above quotations I am indebted to Diwan Sobhraj Nirmaldas. J.F.K.

how the rite is to be performed, how the consecrated meat is to be disposed of: they also show that the reward of sacrifice in both the worlds is great.

According to Dr. Hughes, the learned compiler of "A Dictionary of Islam," the Muhammadan sacrifice, in character, is (1) Commemorative, (2) Self-Dedicatory, and (3) Eucharistic. This, the reader, no doubt, will have observed for himself. What strikes one particularly is that in offering sacrifices the Holy Prophet did not content himself by offering them as from himself, but, out of the nobility of his heart, he offered them as also 'from his children,' 'from his tribe,' 'from his people': the actual dedication having been

"O God accept this from Muhammad, and from his children,
and from his tribe"

"O God this sacrifice is of Thee, and for Thee: accept it then
from Muhammad and his people."

The Holy Prophet at the same time realised and told the Faithful that "their (of the animals sacrificed) flesh will never reach to God, nor yet their blood, but the piety from you will reach Him (vide XXII, 37, Al Qur'an)." Al Baizawi on this verse said "It, the flesh of the sacrifice, does not reach unto God, nor its blood, but the piety (taqwa) that is the sincerity and intention of your heart" (Tafsir-ul-Baizawi, vol ii, page 52).

By his injunctions in the matter of sacrifice the Holy Prophet of Islam appears to have sought to inculcate among the Faithful the virtues of piety and sincerity of intention, gratefulness to God, the Giver of Food, through the symbolic offering of something of value as a mark of one's gratitude for the Creator's bounties, self-effacement, and consideration for the needy. He also sought to teach them the virtue of thrift, restricting the sacrifice in the case of individuals to the least costly animal, namely, the goat.

These were noble virtues, worthy of the great Prophet of a great Faith—Virtues universal in their applicability at all times and in all climes.

To the Arabs who were a pastoral people cattle were their most valuable possession, in most cases perhaps their only possession. The offering of cattle by such people thus amounted to a valuable sacrifice. Had the Arabs of the Prophet's days been other than pastoral, no doubt offerings in forms other than animal offering might have been indicated. The object, of course, would have remained the same, namely, the inculcation of the above virtues among the people, and it would have been secured equally satisfactorily through such other symbols as the Holy Prophet might have selected for the purpose. That animals were selected as symbols appears thus to have arisen from the circumstances of the people affected, which can be easily understood and as to which none can raise any reasonable question.

From the extracts given above it appears that even in those early days of Islam there existed a "custom of omitting the offering of sacrifice on the appointed days, and afterwards bestowing an adequate sum of money upon the poor." The actual offering of sacrifices on the appointed days was deemed "more laudable" than the above custom. It appears that even in those early days, where any one omitted, or was unable from any cause, to offer sacrifice, it was the custom to make up for the omission by "bestowing an adequate sum of money upon the poor." Thus the poor were duly protected and were not allowed to suffer as a result of the omission to offer sacrifice. This arrangement thus appears to have been 'permissible,' though not deemed to be so 'laudable' as the actual offering of sacrifice.

Considering the times and the circumstances in this country, it strikes one that the circumstances of our Muslim brothers in India today differ from those of the Arabs of the Holy Prophet's day in one most important point, namely, that in those days when the Arabs had accepted Islam, they became and remained all Muslims, living with and among fellow-Muslims following the same Faith and observing the same rites. This is not the case with the Muslims in India today who in most cases have to live with and among non-Muslims. In purely Muslim localities, the observance of such rites as the offering of sacrifices would raise no question. A question, however, would and does arise in the case of the Muslims who live in localities with mixed population. Here the circumstances are different, and in the matter of sacrifice as in other matters of their day to day life, they find it necessary as also advisable to take due account of the circumstances surrounding them. Suppose, for instance, there are two Muslim families living in adjoining houses in a street. Suppose, on any given day, there happens to be an occasion for rejoicings in one family, but sickness or mourning in the other. It would be but natural that the rejoicing in the former should be subdued or even postponed out of consideration for the feelings of the latter. If the day happens to be the Id day, the day for sacrifice, both the families would offer sacrifice in performance of their religious duty, but while the rite would be performed in the latter family quietly, there would not be much of the usual festivity in the former either. The under-lying consideration would be the normal human feeling—consideration for the feelings of one's neighbours: and this would be wholly in conformity with the injunctions in the Holy Qur'an in Surah IV, verse 40, where Muslims are enjoined to be kind to their neighbours, and neighbours would be not only those who worship in the same mosque, not only those whose houses are within 40 cubits of one another, but also the occupants of 40 houses on either side of one's residence. (a)

The same would be the position where the two neighbours happen to be the followers of different faiths, say one a Muslim and the other a Hindu. Suppose there is illness or mourning in the Hindu family: would the Muslim neighbour hold festivities thereby injuring the feelings of his Hindu neighbour? The Muslim would be aware that cow sacrifice would be a sacrilege to his Hindu neighbour and would hurt his feelings. Would he, despite this knowledge, perform the rite with ostentation regardless of his neighbour's feelings? No. He would do his duty without ostentation, quietly, away from his neighbour's eyes and ears, and, in every possible way, try not to hurt his feelings. This would be true neighbourliness as enjoined in the Holy Qur'an. This would be bare humanity as we all understand it. To do otherwise would be to cease to be human and reduce oneself to the grade of an animal—a brute! and Muslims never shall be brutes as they never shall be slaves!

It is not in their nature to be unkind to any one. By nature they are large-hearted: and their noble religion teaches them kindness, brotherliness. Muslims therefore, will not, cannot, be unkind to their Hindu neighbours, and innumerable acts of neighbourly kindness and brotherliness are enacted daily by Muslims towards Hindus, as by Hindus towards Muslims, throughout the length and breadth of the country, but which acts in their daily millions go unrecorded!

It would, therefore, be unbelievable that Muslims should want to hurt the feelings of their Hindu neighbours over the question of Cow Sacrifice. And, yet, this is far from being a simple question. On the one hand they know that the Holy Qur'an enjoins animal sacrifice including cow sacrifice on certain occasions. On the other hand they also know that cow sacrifice would hurt the feelings of their Hindu neighbours. They know further that the Holy Qur'an also enjoins on

(a) "A DICTIONARY OF ISLAM," by the Revd. Thomas Patrick Hughes, p. 432.

them kindness towards their neighbours. If they were to perform cow-sacrifice in obedience to the injunctions of the Holy Qur'an, they would hurt the feelings of their Hindu neighbours, and this would be opposed to the injunctions of the Holy Qur'an enjoining kindness towards neighbours. It cannot be said that the Holy Qur'an contemplated any distinctions between neighbours and neighbours—between Muslim neighbours and Hindu neighbours—for the simple reason that no such distinction is made in the Holy Qur'an. What, then, are the Faithful to do? Is there a way whereby they may be enabled to comply with both the injunctions of the Holy Qur'an, both in the matter of animal sacrifice and in the matter of kindness to neighbours?

Yes, by the kindness of Allah, the All-Merciful, He has provided a way: just as He has laid injunctions and duties on the Faithful, so has He also provided the ways and means of carrying out those injunctions and performing those duties. If we seek enlightenment in a spirit of humility, enlightenment shall certainly be vouchsafed to us.

The Lord is All-Knowing, as He is All-Merciful. He knows the future, as He knows the past. In His infinite knowledge He was aware when He issued injunctions enjoining animal sacrifices, that the time would come and the occasion arise when the Faithful would be faced with a situation as now exists in this country. And to earnest devout souls it would seem that other animals, animals other than the cow, such as the goat, were indicated as suitable for sacrifice, along with the indication for the cow, expressly with the object of providing a way of meeting a situation as obtains in India today. To earnest and devout souls it would also appear that the custom to which reference has been made above—the custom of omitting animal sacrifice on the appointed days and subsequently atoning for the omission by bestowing an adequate sum of money on the poor—it would seem that this custom which was in vogue even in the earliest days of Islam, was allowed, as a 'custom,' to the Faithful, expressly to meet a situation such as exists in India today.

To the Faithful guidance is thus provided in the Holy Qur'an in two directions, by following either of which they could meet the difficult situation that faces them in this matter in India, in conformity with the requirements of their Faith, and without infringing its injunctions in any way. These two directions would be:—

- (a) that actual animal sacrifice might be omitted on the appointed days, and, as an atonement for such omission, an adequate sum of money might be bestowed on the poor:
- (b) that instead of offering cows as sacrifice on the appointed days, other animals, such as goats, might be offered as sacrifice.

On a careful study of the relative directions given in the Holy Qur'an, and the extracts given above under the head 'Sacrifice,' it would appear to an unbiassed mind that the Muslim Doctors and Divines might find the following courses to hold in them the prospects of providing the right path for the Faithful in these difficult times,—course or courses that might be best suited to secure the temporal and spiritual welfare of the Muslims in India:—

- (i) that as a temporary measure and for a specified period of say three years, or five years, or ten years—I would suggest ten years—animal sacrifices be not offered, but, in their place, the Faithful might make cash collections among themselves of about the value of a goat from each person, and from the total cash collections they might distribute cash help to the poor which would enable them to purchase meat and other necessities for themselves from the bazar;

- (ii) that, alternatively, as the sacrifice established for every single person is a goat, goats only be offered as from individuals, and collective sacrifice of cows and camels be avoided:
- (iii) that, since there would probably be some waste of animal flesh if more animals were sacrificed than could be consumed, the Muslim residents of each quarter or street of a town, and of each village, might, by mutual consultation among themselves, fix the number of goats to be sacrificed. For example, if there are 50 Muslims in a moholla, and if they consider that 20 goats would be sufficient for their consumption, then only 20 goats might be sacrificed as offerings from 20 persons, and the remaining 30 persons might contribute cash offerings from which other necessities might be purchased and distributed among the poor:
- (iv) that, as an alternative, a single goat be sacrificed on the Day of the Great Festival, the 10th of Zu'l-Hijjah (Idu'l-Azha), on behalf of the Muslim congregation of the locality at the appointed time, either on the mosque premises, or at the local Idgah, as may be decided by the Muslims, this sacrifice being regarded as a token one, a symbol, on behalf of the entire congregation of the Faithful, and, in addition to this, cash collections might be made and distributed among the poor as in (i) above:
- (v) that, if the Muslim Doctors and Divines, after full and mature consideration, decide that a symbol of cow sacrifice must be retained and observed yearly as evidence of their right to offer such sacrifice, then, as an alternative to the foregoing or additionally thereto, a single cow might be offered as sacrifice on behalf of the entire Muslim population of India in the following manner:—

that a high dignitary in Islam in India, being a nominee of the Jamait-e-Ulema-e-Hind or of the All-India Muslim League, or otherwise selected by the Muslims in any manner they may decide upon for themselves, might be deputed to visit the Holy Shrine at Makkah every year, and on the Day of the Great Festival, the 10th of Zu'l-Hijjah (Idu'l-Azha), offer as sacrifice a single cow, to be purchased in Makkah, out of the contributions raised by the Muslims of India by token contributions from all the Provinces, the offering being made in the name of the entire Muslim population of India. There is the great and incontrovertible precedent set up by the Holy Prophet himself when he made offerings, as 'from his tribe,' and 'from his people' (*vide* page 141 ante). The most scrupulous amongst us could not desire a more authentic and authoritative indication and precedent to guide us. And, if the Muslims in India, with piety in their hearts, turn their thoughts to Makkah on the appointed day, and with the name of Allah the Most Great on their lips, offer food and cash assistance to the poor around them, verily, such offering made by them at home, and that made on their behalf at the Holy Shrine, will be as acceptable to God as it would be if each one of the Faithful had sacrificed a cow with his own hands.

As has been observed above, the distribution of an adequate sum of money among the poor in place of animal sacrifice is not so laudable, but, as the Holy Prophet has observed, "IT IS NOT THEIR MEAT, NOR THEIR BLOOD,

“THAT REACHES GOD: IT IS YOUR PIETY THAT REACHES HIM,” the Faithful may rest assured and satisfied that so long as they contribute their mite with piety in their hearts and with the name of Allah on their lips, their offering will be accepted by God as due and full discharge of their duty.

These are my humble suggestions as a layman who has the deepest respect and reverence for Islam and its Holy Prophet, in the same degree as he has for the teachings of the great Hindu Faith. I have endeavoured to enter the feelings of my Muslim and Hindu brothers and to feel as they do on this to them a very vital subject: I have endeavoured to follow and put forward their respective points of view and the injunctions of their great religions which are binding on them all alike: I have examined the operation of these injunctions in the present day surroundings and circumstances of these great communities which so differ from those of the peoples to whom they were first issued and the observance of which today in their pristine form and rigidity has created a problem for my Muslim and Hindu brothers. I have at the same time endeavoured to take a detached view of the situation and tried to see if a way might not exist which without affecting the beliefs and observances of either side might yet provide a common meeting ground for them. To my Muslim friends I have made some suggestions above according to my lights. It will be for our learned Doctors and Divines to examine them and advise us according to the Islamic Law and the needs of the times, keeping in view the best interests of the Faithful in India in the present and in the future. It will be the duty of those Muslims who happen to read these suggestions and have the interests of Hindu-Muslim Unity at heart to refer the suggestions to a competent body of Muslim Doctors and Divines for their considered decision: and what they advise and decide we shall accept without question. Of course if the decision happens to be in favour of any or all of the above suggested courses, these would remove for good the one most serious and ever-present source of strife between the Faithful and their Hindu neighbours who, we may be sure, would most heartily and gratefully welcome such a decision.

In the meantime, it seems the position must remain as it now stands, however unsatisfactory it may have proved to be in the present-day circumstances of this country, and it must continue to remain so until, in the apt words of my Young Muslim Friend, the average Muslim, the Muslim Man in the Street, (whose letter is reproduced at page 131 ante), “some other command is sent by God to repeal the current command in respect of cow sacrifice”: or, I may add, until our Muslim Doctors and Divines discover a fresh interpretation of the existing Qur’anic injunctions—a ‘GOLDEN MEAN’—along the lines of my above suggestions, or along any other lines,—an interpretation which, in the result, may prove successful in providing a solution of this most important problem of our day which so far has defied all attempts at solution.

Pending a decision as above, and as an interim arrangement subject to confirmation in God’s own good time, the following Voluntary Agreement of Amity and Concord (which would be a part of the fuller Agreement given later, and which we shall call **“THE TREATY OF PERPETUAL PEACE AND CONCORD BETWEEN THE MUSLIMS AND THE HINDUS OF UNITED INDIA,”**) is suggested for adoption by the Muslims and the Hindus as a code of conduct in relation to each other in the matter of the Question of Cow Sacrifice and Cow Protection:—

THE COW QUESTION

A VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT OF AMITY AND CONCORD

"Whereas it is customary with certain communities in the performance of their religious rites and ceremonials to offer animal sacrifices, including cow sacrifice, and whereas it is customary with certain other communities in the observance of their religious persuasions to attach religious significance to certain animals including the cow whose preservation is deemed by them as enjoined on them by the tenets of their beliefs, and whereas it is the earnest desire of all that as an expression of their mutual fellowship and neighbourliness, nothing shall be allowed to be done which might tend to hurt the religious susceptibilities of any one of them, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED that as a vital contribution towards the establishment and maintenance of an atmosphere of Peace, Amity, Concord, and mutual Respect and Regard, the communities accustomed to offering animal sacrifices shall, as a temporary measure, scrupulously exclude the cow from such offerings.

Whereas further it is customary with certain communities that are used to non-vegetarian diet to include in it beef as an article of food, and whereas for the foregoing reasons and with a view to securing the same end, it is the general desire of all that cow-slaughter shall, as a temporary measure, be discontinued even with the self-imposed denial of an age-old dietary, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED that, as a temporary measure, the slaughter of cows for purposes of food shall be discontinued by directions to be issued by the Muslims of each locality to the local Muslim butchers, throughout the country: Such directions, however, shall in no way affect the undisturbed use, by those who desire it, of canned beef imported from abroad, provided it is ensured that the use of such canned food is not made ostentatiously and in such manner as might hurt men's susceptibilities thereby defeating the object and the spirit underlying this Voluntary Agreement of Amity and Concord.

In the event of the Muslim Doctors and Divines rejecting the suggestions made in this Section, and deciding upon the maintenance of the status quo, IT S HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED as under:—

- (a) that the Hindus admit that Islam enjoins on the Muslims the performance of animal sacrifice including cow sacrifice, and the partaking of animal flesh including cow flesh as an article of food: that in offering such sacrifice and using beef as part of their food the Muslims are within their rights, and that the Hindus shall in no way interfere with the performance of such rites by the Muslims in accordance with the injunctions in their Holy Scriptures: or with the use by them of beef as an article of their food:
- (b) that the Muslims on their part recognise the cow as an object of veneration to the Hindus, and that its slaughter, either for purposes of sacrifice or for food, would hurt the religious susceptibilities of the Hindus: and the Muslims hereby undertake to ensure that in performing such sacrifice scrupulous care shall invariably be taken to ensure that it is done unostentatiously, that animals intended for sacrifice shall not be taken out in processions, and that nothing shall be allowed to be done, or left undone, that might directly or indirectly tend to hurt the feelings of the Hindus:

It is further agreed that where beef is used for purposes of food care shall be taken to ensure that it is not exhibited publicly in Hindu localities, nor so otherwise handled as to hurt the feelings of the Hindus."

Section (ii)—THE AZAN—THE MUSLIM CALL TO PRAYER

The following appears at page 52 of the Pirpur Committee's Report:—

"The Hindus (of Siswar, Bihar) prohibited the Muslims from calling the Azan." (a)

The "forcible stoppage of 'Azan'" is also included among the "legitimate religious and civil rights of the Muslims" of the stoppage of which "innumerable instances" are said to "occur in every province." (b)

From the above extracts it would appear that the Hindus are charged with having "forcibly stopped the calling of the Azan by the Muslims." It makes one sad to hear of this charge: sad because, if true, (and there appears no reason to disbelieve it), it does amount to an interference with the religious practices of the Muslims: sad, because one can see no sense in the stoppage of the Call, and prohibition can only be attributed to sheer ignorance on the part of the Hindus concerned as to what the Call actually is. I give below the text with its translation.

Azan.

The following note appears at pages 28-29 of "A Dictionary of Islam" by the Revd. Thomas Patrick Hughes, B.D., M.R.A.S.

"AZAN—Lit. 'announcement.' The call or summons to public prayers proclaimed by the Mu'azzin (or crier)—in small mosques from the side of the building or at the door, and in large mosques from the minaret.

It is in Arabic as follows:—

اَللّٰهُ اَكْبَرُ - اَللّٰهُ اَكْبَرُ - اَللّٰهُ اَكْبَرُ - اَللّٰهُ اَكْبَرُ
 اَشْهَدُ اَنْ لَا اِلٰهَ اِلَّا اللّٰهُ - اَشْهَدُ اَنْ لَا اِلٰهَ اِلَّا اللّٰهُ
 اَشْهَدُ اَنَّ مُحَمَّدًا رَّسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ - اَشْهَدُ اَنَّ مُحَمَّدًا رَّسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ
 حَتّٰى عَلَى الصَّلٰوةِ - حَتّٰى عَلَى الصَّلٰوةِ - حَتّٰى عَلَى الصَّلٰوةِ
 حَتّٰى عَلَى الصَّلٰوةِ - اَللّٰهُ اَكْبَرُ - اَللّٰهُ اَكْبَرُ - اَللّٰهُ اَكْبَرُ - ط

'Allahu akbar! Allahu akbar! Allahu akbar! Allahu akbar! Ashhadu an la ilaha illa'llah! Ashhadu an la ilaha illa'llah! Ashhadu anna Muhammadar rasulu'llah! Ashhadu anna Muhammadar rasulu'llah! Hayya 'alas-salati! Hayya 'alas-salati! Hayya 'ala 'l-falah! Hayya 'ala 'l-falah! Allahu akbar! Allahu akbar! La ilaha illa'llah!'

Which is translated:—

'God is most great! God is most great! God is most great! God is most great! I testify that there is no god but God! I testify that there is no god but God! I testify that Muhammad is the Apostle of God! I testify that Mahammad is the Apostle of God! Come to prayer! Come

(a) Report of the Inquiry Committee appointed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League to inquire into Muslim Grievances in Congress Provinces (presided over by Raja Syed Mohammad Mehdi of Pirpur.)

(b) Extract from the Article with the title "Can Hindus and Muslims ever become One Nation" at pages 107-115 of the publication "India's Problem of Her Future Constitution."

to prayer! Come to salvation! Come to salvation! God is most great! God is most great! There is no god but God!

In the Azan in the early morning, after the words, 'Come to salvation!' is added

"As-salatu khairun mina 'n-naumi! As-salatu khairun mina 'n-naumi! Prayer is better than sleep! Prayer is better than sleep!"

The Shi'ahs make a slight alteration in the Azan, by adding the words, Hayya 'ala khairi' l-'amali! Hayya 'ala khairi' l-'amali! "Come to the best of works! Come to the best of works!" and by repeating the last sentence of the Azan, "There is no god but God!" twice instead of once, as in the Sunni Azan.

When the Azan is recited, it is usual for men of piety and religious feeling to respond to each call, as, for example, when the Mu'azzin cries:—

'Allahu akbar! Allahu akbar! Allahu akbar! Allahu akbar!'

Those who hear it repeat:—

'Allahu akbar! Allahu akbar! Allahu akbar! Allahu akbar!'

The Mu'azzin says:—'I testify that there is no god but God; I testify that there is no god but God.'

They reply:—'I testify that there is no god but God; I testify that there is no god but God!'

Mu'azzin:—'I testify that Muhammad is the Apostle of God.'

Reply:—'I testify that Muhammad is the Apostle of God!'

Mu'azzin:—'Come to prayer.'

Reply:—'I have no power nor strength but from God the most High and Great.'

Mu'azzin:—'Come to salvation.'

Reply:—'What God willeth will be; what He willeth not willeth not be.'

The recital of the Azan must be listened to with great reverence. If a person be walking at the time, he should stand still; if reclining 'sit up'. Mr. Lane, in his 'Modern Egyptians,' says, 'Most of the Mu'azzins of Cairo have harmonious and sonorous voices, which they strain to the utmost pitch; yet there is a simple and solemn melody in their chants which is very striking, particularly in the stillness of the night.' But Vambéry remarks that 'the Turkistanees most carefully avoid all tune and melody. The manner in which the Azan is cried in the west is here (in Bokhara) declared sinful, and the beautiful melancholy notes which, in the silent hour of a moonlit evening, are heard from the slender minarets on the Bosphorus, fascinating every hearer, would be listened to by the Bokhariot with feelings only of detestation.'

The summons to prayer was at first the simple cry, 'Come to public prayer.' After the Qiblah was changed, Muhammad bethought himself of a more formal call. Some suggested the Jewish trumpet, others the Christian bell; but neither was grateful to the Prophet's ear. The Azan, or call to prayer, was then established. Tradition claims for it a supernatural origin, thus:—'While the matter was under discussion, 'Abdu'llah, a Khazrajite, dreamed that he met a man clad in green raiment, carrying a bell. 'Abdu'llah sought to buy it, saying that it would do well for bringing together the assembly of the faithful. 'I will show thee a better way,' replied the stranger; 'let a crier cry aloud, 'God is most great,' etc.'" Waking from sleep, 'Abdu'llah proceeded to Muhammad, and told him his dream. (Muir, from Katibu 'l-Wakidi). Hishami recites the story as if 'Abdu'llah had actually met the man.

Bingham, in his 'Antiquities,' (vol. ii, book viii, ch. vii.), relates that, in the monastery of virgins which Paula, the famous Roman lady, set up and governed at Jerusalem, the signal for prayer was given by one going about and singing 'Hallelujah!' for that was their call to church, as St. Jerome informs us.

The Azan is proclaimed before the stated times of prayer, either by one of the congregation, or by the Mu'azzin or crier who is paid for the purpose. He must stand with his face towards Makkah, with the points of his fore-fingers in his ears, and recite the formula which has been given above.

"It must not be recited by an unclean person, a drunkard, a madman, or a woman."

As will appear from the above text and translation, the Azan is a 'call to prayers', pure and simple, and nothing more. It says:—

God is most great . . . ∴ Do the Hindus gainsay it?

There is no god but God . . . So did Lord Shri Krishna say to Arjuna
"I am One". (a)

Muhammad is the Apostle

of God—The same may be said of any of the other Prophets.

The Azan does not assert that Hazrat Muhammad is the only Apostle of God. A Parsee may say "Zarathushtra is the Apostle of God": that would not be without truth; he may also say with his Muslim brother "Muhammad is the Apostle of God." Do the Hindus assert that Hazrat Muhammad and the Lord Jesus the Christ are not the Apostles of God? Do the Hindus think that the Azan asserts that Hazrat Muhammad is the only Apostle of God? If so, they are entirely mistaken: for, Hazrat Muhammad has clearly acknowledged the Prophets and Apostles who had gone before him which would show that the Holy One did not claim to be the only Apostle of God, and that the Faithful could not possibly make an assertion which would be opposed to Hazrat Muhammad's own declaration! (b)

Come to prayer	} —	That prayer leads to salvation is a belief not at all peculiar to the Muslims. We all pray for our salvation. Do not the Hindus pray for their salvation?
Come to salvation		

(a) GITA EXPLAINED by Dnyaneshwar Maharaj, Translation by Manu Subedar page 77.

(b) "According to Muhammadan writers a *nabi* is anyone directly inspired by God, and *rasul* and *mursul*, one to whom a special mission has been entrusted. Hazrat Muhammad is related to have said (Mishkat,— Traditions—, book xxiv, ch. i, pt. 3) that there were 124,000 *arabiya*, or prophets, and 315 apostles or messengers. Nine of the special messengers are entitled *Ulu'l-'Azm*, or possessors of constancy", namely, Noah, Abraham, David, Jacob, Joseph, Job, Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad. Six are dignified with special titles: Adam, *Saifu'llah*, the Chosen of God; Noah, *Nabiyn'llah*, the Preacher of God; Abraham, *Rabbil-'Alam*, the Friend of God; Moses, *Kalimu'llah*, the Converser with God; Jesus, *Ruhu'llah*, the Spirit of God; Muhammad, *Rasulu'llah*, the Messenger of God" (A Dictionary of Islam, p. 475).

What is there in the Azan then that sounds objectionable to the Hindu ear?

We all have our Calls to Prayer: the Christians and Parsees have their bell: the Muslims would also have had their bell had not Abdu'llah, the Khazrajite, chanced to meet the stranger in his dream narrated in the Note above: even the Hindus themselves have their Call, the shankh (bugle), the nagara (drum), and even the bell: and these are used not only as a call to prayers, but also to awaken sleeping deities! Do the Muslims object to the Hindus sounding their bell, their nagara and their shankh?

I have known Hindus and Muslims living together in the same street with a mandir and a mosque not far apart. The Azan was called and is still being called at the appointed hours day in and day out: the shankh, the nagara and the bell played and still play, with unabated zest, to greet each breaking dawn: I have seen more than one generation of the residents of that street, Hindus and Muslims, being gathered to their fathers: I have not known a single instance of objection having been raised to the Call to Prayer either from a Hindu or from a Muslim. I am inclined to believe that the occurrences referred to in the Pirpur Report were probably isolated ones and by no means formed a common feature of Hindu-Muslim relations at any time.

By her Proclamation of November 1, 1858, Queen Victoria gave her Indian subjects the following solemn assurance:—

"We declare it to be our royal will and pleasure that none be in any wise favoured, none molested or disquieted, by reason of their religious faith or observances, but that all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the law; and we do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under us that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of our subjects on pain of our highest displeasure" (a)

The Congress in its resolution on Fundamental Rights has declared:—

"(ii) Every citizen shall enjoy freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess and practise his religion, subject to public order and morality." (b)

No future constitution, either of a Hindustan, a Pakistan, or of a United India, can possibly permit the slightest whittling down of this vital fundamental right of the Indian citizen. The Pakistan Resolution of the All-India Muslim League laid down, *inter alia*,

"that adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in these regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them." (c)

The Muslim Azan, as a 'call to prayer', has, as a custom, acquired by now the sanctity of a centuries-old usage which no court of law may disturb. It is a religious observance which is clearly protected by all the declarations cited above.

To men like me, the simplicity of its language, its simple references to the Unity of God and to His Apostle, the traditions that have woven themselves

(a) THE OXFORD HISTORY OF INDIA.—Smith, pages 728-29.

(b) Pages 6-7 ante.

(c) INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1940, Vol. I, page 312.

around it, invest the Azan with a character peculiarly its own: to men like me, it is a prayer in itself: every time I have heard it, I seem to have seen rise before my mind's eye the countless millions of devotees who, from lofty minarets or humble street corners, whether in the land of the Prophet, in Stamboul, Teheran, or Jerusalem, in Cairo or Granada, in Cabul, Delhi, Bokhara, China or Java, recited the Call in their time down the centuries inviting the Faithful to prayers in the name of God and His Prophet: every time I have heard it, I have stopped in my occupation of the moment, and as I followed the Call, I have felt myself uplifted to the presence of my Creator. I have experienced the same feeling every time I have heard the church bells going, or the nagara and the shankh at dawn announcing to my Hindu brothers the approach of Aruna at the birth of each new day, "when the shining Usha of the Zoroastrian faith borne in her brilliant chariot drawn by four ruddy steeds comes upon the earth and awakens all." (a)

What is there in the Azan, I ask again, which sounds objectionable to the Hindu ear? Does the Hindu think that it invites him to go to the mosque? Does he think that in calling the hearer to Allah it takes him away from his Ishwar? Is his faith in his own particular persuasion so weak that he fears harm to his belief from the sound of the Call falling on his ears? Does he fear that the listening to the Azan will draw him to Islam?

I am afraid the opposition from the Hindus to the Azan, wherever it has occurred, has been the result of ignorance on their part as to the actual meaning of the Call, and I feel confident that if the meaning of the Azan were explained to the Hindus, any opposition that might be existing anywhere would soon disappear. It would therefore be the duty of the Hindu intelligentsia to acquaint themselves with the meaning of the Azan as has been given in this Section and to spread the knowledge among their co-religionists both in the towns as well as in the villages and assure them that the reciting of the Azan by their Muslim neighbours is in no way harmful to the religious susceptibilities of the Hindus.

The "difference" between our Hindu and Muslim friends over the question of the Azan is thus easily explained and easily removable. With the realisation of its meaning, the Hindus themselves will come forward to assure their Muslim brothers that with the knowledge of its meaning there remains no ground for any objection whatsoever to the Azan which may henceforth be freely recited by the Muslims throughout the length and breadth of Hindustan without any let or hindrance from the Hindus.

The relative clause, covering this subject, in the Voluntary Agreement of Amity and Concord (which would be a part of the fuller Agreement given later, and which we shall call "THE TREATY OF PERPETUAL PEACE AND CONCORD BETWEEN THE MUSLIMS AND THE HINDUS OF UNITED INDIA"), would be a simple one, somewhat as under:—

"That whereas instances have occurred in the past where the Hindus of certain places have raised objections to the recital by their Muslim neighbours of the Muslim Call to Prayer known as the AZAN, and whereas the Hindus are satisfied that the text of the Azan contains nothing that may tend to prove harmful to their religious beliefs and susceptibilities, and whereas it is the earnest desire of the Hindus that the relations between the two communities should be placed firmly on foundations of mutual goodwill and harmonious and amicable neighbourliness, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED that the Hindus shall, on no account whatever, do, or omit to do, anything which might tend to interfere with the free and undisturbed recital

of the Azan by the Muslims in accordance with the requirements of their religion and their customary rites."

Section (iii)—MUSIC BEFORE MOSQUES

The following passages appear at pages 69-71 of the Report dated 15th November, 1938, of the Pirpur Committee appointed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League, to enquire into the complaints of "hardship, ill-treatment and injustice meted out to the Muslims in various Congress Government Provinces":—

"The Hindus of the village Satpati in the Palgarh Taluqa, District Thana, played music before a mosque on August 9, 1937. The Musalmans tried to prevent it with the result that there was a minor Hindu-Muslim riot. The Muslims being in a very small minority had to yield and the Hindus kept on playing music, deliberately outraging the religious feelings of the Muslims, and no protection was given to the Muslims by the Government. The Muslims persisted in their demand to prevent a recurrence of the incident, but with no result. The Hindus in return socially boycotted the Muslims." (Pages 69-70 of the Report.)

"A similar incident occurred at Boisar in the Taluqa of Palgarh when Hindus played music before that mosque and on protest being lodged by the Muslims the Hindus boycotted them socially." (Page 70 of the Report.)

"There was an agreement between the Hindus and Muslims of Dhanduka, a town in Ahmedabad, that music will not be played within a certain distance of a mosque. But the Hindus broke this agreement in August 1938. Telegrams were sent to the district authorities and the Home Member but no steps were taken to prevent the breach of the agreement." (Page 71 of the Report.)

The following resolution, No. XI, was adopted by the All-India Hindu Mahasabha at its session in December 1938:—

"The Hindu Mahasabha declares that it is the social and religious as also the civic right of the Hindus to carry without let or hindrance their processions accompanied by music along all public roads at all times. This right has also been, from time to time, upheld by courts of law.

The Hindu Mahasabha, therefore, strongly resents the unwarrantable demands made by the Muslim community for stopping music on public roads, in temples and even in private places before and near the mosques in utter disregard of the religious, civic and legal rights of the Hindus and condemns the action of Government in restricting these rights in response to this demand.

The Mahasabha, therefore, calls upon the Hindus to assert and maintain this right in face of all opposition, whether private or official, ignoring all risks involved." (a)

Criticising the Congress Government of Bihar, Mr. Savarkar said:—

"No conchshells could be blown. No temple bells could be rung. Music was prohibited, and civic and religious rights of the Hindus were torn to pieces."

(Extract from the Presidential Address of Mr. V. D. Savarkar at the Bihar Hindu Sabha Conference held at Monghyr on 26th March 1939, *vide* the Indian Annual Register, 1939, Vol. I, page 389.)

The position in Law may be gathered from the following extracts:—

“It has been held in several cases that the right to conduct religious processions in the public streets is a right inherent in every person, provided he does not thereby invade the rights of property enjoyed by others or cause a public nuisance or interfere with the ordinary use of the streets by the public and subject to such directions or prohibitions as may be issued by the Magistrate to prevent obstructions to the thoroughfare or breaches of the public peace. Further the right to carry on the worship of any deity in any manner that a person pleases subject to similar conditions is also a right inherent in every person, and it is an important right.” (Mr. Justice Shah in *Waman Balvant Kashikar v. Babu Harshet Shete*: The Bombay Law Reporter, Vol. XXII, 1920, p. 311.)

“It would seem, broadly speaking, that every citizen has a right to worship as he pleases so long as he does not thereby trench upon the rights of office or property of other persons. He has, broadly speaking, similarly a right to go in procession so long as he does not interfere with the rights of others to the unrestricted use of the public roads and streets. But the exercise of these rights is always subject to such orders as might be necessary to prevent disorder or riot by the Magistrates under Section 44 of the Bombay District Police Act or Section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code.”

(Mr. Justice Hayward in the above suit, page 313).

“Persons of whatever sect are entitled to conduct religious processions through public streets so that they do not interfere with the ordinary use of such streets by the public and subject to such directions as the magistrates may lawfully give to prevent obstructions of the thoroughfare or breaches of the public peace.”

(Turner C. J. in *Parthasaradi Ayyangar v. Chinnakrishna Ayyangar*, 1882, I. L. R., 5 Mad. 304,309).

In *Sundaram Chetti and others v. the Queen*, before a Full Bench the position was maintained, and it was further laid down that the worshippers in a mosque or temple which abutted on a high road could not compel the processionists to intermit their worship while passing the mosque or temple on the ground that there was continuous worship there.

(1883, I. L. R., 6 Mad., 203.)

In *Manzur Hasan and others (Plaintiffs) v. Muhammad Zaman and others (Defendants)*, before the Trial Judge (The Second Subordinate Judge of Aligarh, September 10, 1918), the plaintiffs prayed for “a declaration that the plaintiffs, along with other Shia residents of qasba Aurangabad, are entitled to stay and perform the ‘matam’ in a circle at the public thoroughfare at the back of the newly built Jama Masjid and that the defendants have no right or title to offer obstructions to the same or to stop it at any time...”. On the issue “how long, if ever, have the Shias been using the road in question in the manner alleged? Does the user give them any right to continue it,” the Trial Judge held “that the defendants no longer denied that the procession used to pass through the lane, but they alleged that the music used to stop in the vicinity of the mosque; the Judge found, however, that was not so, and that interference by the Sunnis was a new matter and that other religious processions passing the mosque not been interfered with.” With regard to an issue “whether the

Without prejudice to the rights of communities, legal or other, alleged or established, and without prejudice to customs, established or challenged, and with a view to promoting harmonious relations between the major communities, and between sections of those or other communities, the following Voluntary Agreement of Amity and Concord (which would be a part of the fuller Agreement given later and which we shall call "THE TREATY OF PERPETUAL PEACE AND CONCORD BETWEEN THE MUSLIMS AND THE HINDUS OF UNITED INDIA"), is suggested for adoption by the Muslims and the Hindus as a code of conduct in relation to each other in the matter of the Question of Music before Mosques:—

MUSIC BEFORE MOSQUES

A VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT OF AMITY AND CONCORD

"That in cases where communities have hitherto been accustomed to take out in public streets communal processions, or family parties, or other gatherings, on religious, ceremonial, or other occasions such as on religious or communal festivals, weddings, funerals, etc., such processions, etc., according to the prevailing custom and usage, being accompanied by music, either vocal or instrumental, individual or collective, or being accompanied by the utterance of cries or slogans, repeated individually or collectively, or by delivery of harangues, use of gestures or mimetic representation, exhibition or dissemination of pictures, symbols or placards, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED, without prejudice to the legal rights, if any, of parties concerned, and as a token of mutual goodwill and harmonious and amicable neighbourliness, that where the route of such procession, etc., lies past a place of worship of any other community, the repeating of slogans, etc., or the singing or playing of music, shall voluntarily be stopped over a distance of one hundred yards while approaching the place of worship, and for a further one hundred yards after passing the place of worship: and that due decorum and silence shall voluntarily be observed by the processionists over the above distance of two hundred yards as a mark of the respect due to all places of worship.

That where the local circumstances do not permit of the above distances being observed to their full extent, such lesser distances as may be feasible shall be determined and adopted by the communities concerned by mutual agreement, and in consultation with and with the approval of the authorities of the place of worship concerned.

That where such distances cannot be determined by the communities concerned by agreement between themselves, it is hereby voluntarily agreed that in such cases both the communities shall jointly approach the local government authorities to fix such distances, and such decision shall be accepted by both the sides.

That it is hereby further agreed voluntarily that for the period of the Agreement, which shall be twenty years to start with and renewable for further periods by mutual agreement, it shall be the duty of the acknowledged local Elders of the community to which the processionists belong, to accompany the procession throughout its passage through the public street concerned with a view to ensuring that this Agreement is duly carried out by the processionists both in the letter and in the spirit: It shall likewise be the duty of the acknowledged local Elders of the community to which belongs the place of worship situated in the street in question, that they shall remain present in the place of worship, along with the authorities of the place of worship, throughout

the time the procession passes over the prescribed distance on either side of the place of worship, with a view to ensuring that those inside the place of worship maintain perfect peace and that nothing untoward is allowed to occur while the procession is passing over the prescribed distance on either side of the place of worship."

Section (iv)—THE LANGUAGE QUESTION—URDU vs. HINDI

(Including brief references to the handicaps operating in the case of the Education of the Muslims in the Congress-governed Provinces.)

The Urdu Language—Its Origin

"They (the Turks) claimed a superiority individually in public and private estimation as belonging to the dominant class, but they did not herd together as a separate horde. The different races met and mixed in affairs of government, on their private business, in commerce and trade. But the foreign Musulman never entirely coalesced with the native Hindu. Religion continued always to keep them widely apart in their domestic intercourse, in their amusements, their customs and their habits of thinking. They were two different elements, possessed of repulsive qualities, which however closely pressed together, never amalgamated. The language both of the country and the towns remained unchanged. During the two first reigns of the new dynasty, the Turki continued to be the language of the emperor and his Turki grandees: but the Persian by degrees became that of the court; at the same time that a different language, the Urdu Bhasha, the language of the horde or royal camp, composed in its elements of the language of Upper Hindustan, and of some other native Indian dialects, with a large infusion of Persian, became, even more than it had hitherto been, the medium of intercourse of the many separate nations and tribes which constituted the imperial army. Nor was it confined to the camp, but gradually came to be understood by the servants in the different departments of government, and by most of the chief village-officers in the whole extent of the many-tongued empire." (a)

"The various necessities which forced the Muhammadans and Hindus to meet each other involved the evolution of a common language. Some Muhammadans learned Hindi and even wrote in it, as Malik Muhammad of Jais did in the time of Humayun. Multitudes of Hindus must have acquired some knowledge of Persian. A convenient compromise between the two languages resulted in the formation of Urdu, the camp language, the name being derived from the Turki word 'urdu', 'camp', the original form of the English word 'horde'. Urdu is a Persianized form of Western Hindi, as spoken especially in the neighbourhood of Delhi. Its grammar and structure continue to be Hindi in the main, while the words are largely Persian. The language of Persia after the Muhammadan conquest became filled with Arabic words which, consequently, are numerous in Urdu. No definite date can be assigned to the beginnings of Urdu, which shades off into Hindi by insensible gradations, but it is certain that during the Sultanate period the evolution of a language intelligible to both the conquerors and the conquered went on unceasingly. Urdu gradually became the vernacular of Indian Muhammadans and developed a literature.

(a) "HISTORY OF INDIA UNDER BABAR AND HUMAYUN" by William Erskine, Vol. I, pages 21-22.

Many Hindi words occur in the writings of Amir or Mir Khusrū, who died in 1325, and is sometimes reckoned as a writer of Urdu." (a)

The Muslim View

"We may point out that the Urdu language came into existence as the result of an attempt to take a purely Aryan language and turn it into a common language so that both Hindus and Muslims may understand each other. It is not a purely Muslim language as the modern champions of Hindustani would have us believe nor it is spoken or understood in Islamic countries. The Muslims who came to India spoke either Persian or Arabic. There was no reason why they should have adopted an entirely new language if it was not for the purpose of having a common language with the inhabitants of the country. Urdu is thus the *lingua franca* of India—the great hinder of different peoples." (b)

"Urdu was built up by the contributions of both Hindus and Muslims. The former have done as much to make it the common language of the country as the latter." (c)

"It is thus clear that Muslims far from being opposed to the evolution of a common language for the country were in fact the first to realise its necessity and have done their best to evolve one. Unfortunately, however, the communal tension, which made its first appearance in the country in the beginning of this century, also affected the question of language, and Urdu, which had so far been accepted as the *lingua franca* of the country, was dubbed as the language of the Muslims alone.

We may further point out that the Muslims, having decided to have Urdu as their mother tongue, took to the language in right earnest and their entire literature, including all branches of knowledge, has been built up in this language. As such they attach great importance to the preservation of Urdu as written in the Persian script and would stoutly resist all attempts to destroy it." (d)

The Hindu View

The following Resolution, No. XVI, was adopted by the All-India Hindu Mahasabha at its sessions held in December 1938 :—

"NATIONAL LANGUAGE AND SCRIPT.—The Hindu Mahasabha declares that Hindi (not Hindusthani—rather 'Sanskrit nistha' Hindi) that is based on and drawing its nourishment from Sanskrit vocabulary is and rightfully deserves to be the National Language and Devnagari as the National Script of Hindusthan. The Mahasabha strongly condemns the overt attempts made by the Indian National Congress in general and the Congress Governments in particular to make Hindustani as the *Lingua Franca* of this country in craven fear of, and with a view to placate, the Moslem opinion in this behalf. The Mahasabha calls upon the Hindu community to resist stoutly by all means in its power all such attempts to recognise and encourage Hindusthani in preference to Hindi." (e)

The Congress View.

The following is an extract from a letter, dated 6th April 1938, from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to Mr. M. A. Jinnah :—

"About Urdu and Hindi—The Congress has declared in favour of guarantees for languages and culture. I want to encourage all the great

(a) THE OXFORD HISTORY OF INDIA by Vincent Smith, pages 259-260.

(b), (c), (d),—THE PIRPUR INQUIRY COMMITTEE REPORT, pages 29-30.

(e) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1938, Vol. II, page 339.

provincial languages of India at the same time, to make Hindustani, as written both in Nagri and Urdu Scripts, the national language. Both Scripts should be officially recognised and the choice should be left to the people concerned. In fact this policy is being pursued by the Congress Ministries." (a)

The following is the text of a resolution adopted by the All-India Congress Committee in September 1938:—

"Hindustani—Whereas the question of a common language for the whole of India is of supreme importance and whereas the Hindi-Urdu controversy has taken a very communal turn and whereas the position taken up by the Indian National Congress is not properly appreciated, this Committee reiterates that the Indian National Congress stands for Hindustani written in both Devanagari and Persian Scripts as the National Language of India and directs all Congressmen to popularise Hindustani and to desist from taking part in the Hindi-Urdu controversy." (b)

In an article in the Harijan Mahatma Gandhi wrote, inter alia, as under:—

"So far as the Congress is concerned, Hindustani is its recognised official language designed as an all-India language for inter-provincial contact. *It is not to supplant but to supplement provincial languages.....* For the purpose of crystallising Hindustani, Hindi and Urdu may be regarded as feeders. A Congressman must, therefore, wish well to both and keep in touch with both forms as far as he can. This Hindustani will have many synonyms to supply the varied requirements of a growing nation rich in provincial languages. Hindustani spoken to a Bengali or to Southern audience will naturally have a large stock of words of Sanskrit origin. The same speech delivered in the Punjab will have a large admixture of words of Arabic and Persian origin. Similar will be the case with audiences composed predominantly of Muslims, who cannot understand many words of Sanskrit origin." (c)

Prof. Beni Prasad.

The following extracts are taken from 'THE HINDU MUSLIM QUESTIONS' by Prof. Beni Prasad, Professor of Politics, University of Allahabad:—

"It is often urged that Hindi and Urdu be left to develop on their own lines, that it is futile to create an artificial language and that the solution of the problem consists in the policy of live and let live. The bi-lingual argument, however, suffers from a fundamental fallacy, psychological and sociological. It regards society as a mechanical co-existence of divergent groups rather than as an organic whole. It may be admitted at once that contract forms an important element in social relationships but philosophy freed itself long ago from the 17th century contractualist view of the foundations and the character of the social life. Society is a psychic process, an interdependent whole, striving for harmony and depending for efficiency on its success in this direction. It is the essential character of society that is responsible for the tendency of those who live permanently together to speak and write more or less the same language. Whatever checks this natural tendency strikes at the foundations of society. Linguistic divergence between neighbours does more than anything else to weaken the consciousness of kind which is the essential force in community. To put the same thing differently, behaviour which

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1938, Vol. I, page 372.

(b) II, " 279.

(c) The PIRPUR Inquiry Committee's Report, page 31.

stops at correctness where cordiality is expected may inflict a deeper wound than downright hostility. In spite of the best intentions at the start, 'live and let live', as a substitute for organic integration, resolves itself imperceptibly into an attempt at domination on one side or on both and 'merges' into the wider game of power politics, as in post-war Europe. Linguistic imperialism may cut as deep as political or economic and set the mind on the road to secession. It is necessary, therefore, to liberate the social organism from the disintegrating influence of those factors which counteract the natural tendency of neighbourhood towards a common idiom." (a)

"As to the script, the primary school may, familiarise every student with both the Arabic and the Devanagari within the jurisdiction of the northern language. A slight exertion in learning a second script will furnish the key to a whole literature and pave the way for communal understanding. When learnt by all, the scripts will not be looked upon as exclusively denominational." (b)

"A more radical solution suggests itself in the form of the adoption of the Roman script. Now that the country has been drawn irrevocably into world affairs, it must devise adequate means of understanding world affairs. Whatever the future relations of England and India may be, the need of learning English and other foreign languages will grow in urgency and intensity. The certainty of larger and larger numbers of Indians—Hindus, Musalmans and others—learning the Latin alphabet suggests the desirability of universalising it here as in Turkey in 1931. A careful system of diacritical signs has adapted it to precise and faultless transliteration; some hundreds of Sanskrit, Arabic and Pali books have been published in the Roman script in Europe. If it were adapted for the Indian languages, it will not entail any phonetic inadequacy; it will not excite any of the particularist jealousies, provincial or communal. It will facilitate the learning of several languages without the serious initial difficulty of mastering a new script; it will mean an enormous saving of time in the long run; it will tend to draw all the languages nearer. On the other hand, the adoption of the Roman script runs counter to nationalist as well as revivalist sentiment; it has the appearance of yet another surrender to British imperialism or European encroachment. It may be that its chances may improve with the attainment of national freedom, but in any case it may be useful to recognise it as one of the two or more scripts for schools, law-courts and other institutions. The option may serve to untie many a little knot and facilitate a smooth working of institutions." (c)

At pages 35-36 of their Report, the PIRPUR Committee have stated as under:—

"It may not be out of place here to state briefly certain principles which have been applied to the solution of the language problem in Switzerland. Out of a total population of about three millions there are about 700,000 French, about 200,000 Italians and the rest Germans. There are 22 cantons of which only three are fully French-speaking, three half-French and half-German-speaking and one is Italian-speaking and 15 are German speaking cantons. The Italians do not form more than six per cent. of the total population, yet the Italian-speaking minority has got the same facilities for receiving education, and shares all the advantages with the rest of the population. In Locarno separate arrangements are made for teaching

(a)	THE HINDU-MUSLIM QUESTIONS by Prof. Banī Prasad, Pages 120-21						
(b)	"	"	"	"	"	"	122
(c)	"	"	"	"	"	"	122-23.

French and German in primary schools. In the canton of Fribourg there are two sets of schools to impart education, one in German and the other in French.

We may further point out the rights the minority enjoyed in Czechoslovakia before the occupation of the Sudetanland by Germany and in spite of that they complained of the lack of an autonomous German section in the Ministry of Education. The complete complaint, which they formulated regarding the inadequate building and subsidy in the German University and the erection of the so-called minority schools, and the closing down of the German primary and technical schools between 1931 and 1935, forms an interesting reading.

In the field of education the Sudetan Germans possessed their own university, two technical high schools, an academy of music, 90 secondary schools (55 gymnasia, 22 'Realshuler' and 13 girls' schools), 14 training colleges, 629 commercial and agricultural schools, 430 higher and 3,363 lower primary schools, and 501 kindergartens.

When a small country like Switzerland can afford to impart education in three languages, surely more than one language can be taught in an Indian province. In Switzerland while arrangements are made to impart education in the mother tongue of the children, the Muslims in India are deprived of this benefit because of the unwillingness of Governments and local bodies to make adequate arrangements. The demands of the Muslims are treated light-heartedly and they are accused of communalism. All this is happening in spite of the constant reiteration of the Karachi minorities resolution by responsible Congress leaders. In view of these facts we are constrained to remark that the Congress High Command is not able to enforce its declared policy in the Congress-governed provinces, at least so far as the welfare of the Muslims is concerned."

Says Prof. Beni Prasad:—

"Naturalism may be recommended not only for reasons of literary style but also for political reasons. If the present artificial tendencies establish themselves as the literary counterpart of political separatism and Hindi becomes the language of the Hindus alone and if Urdu were to become the language of the Muslims all over India, the religious cleavage will coincide with the linguistic and, therefore, with the cultural. It will constitute a gigantic stride towards a double nationality and make the Hindu-Muslim problem not twice but ten times more difficult. The Swiss analogy is irrelevant because the speakers of French, German and Italian inhabit different Cantons or parts of Cantons, while in India the Hindus and the Muslims live together in the same habitat. The real analogy is furnished by Czechoslovakia where little effort was made towards linguistic harmony and whose capital, Prague, was the seat of two universities, a purely Czech one and a purely German one: the result was dismemberment and annexation." (a)

While admitting the force of the above arguments, one might observe that so far as our Man in the Street is concerned, whether a Muslim or a Hindu, he is usually able to follow the spoken Hindi and the spoken Urdu without difficulty. As for written intercourse, the usage of the locality would be a helpful guide: at law, no rigidity need be imposed or enforced: if both sides are Hindus, Hindi might be used: if both are Muslims, Urdu might be used: if one side is Hindu and the other Muslim, documents, etc., might be bi-lingual: it would mean perhaps

the employment of an additional clerk on the court staff, but the extra expenditure would be more than offset by the gain in the removal of an irritant: in trade transactions, the usual formal documents might be bi-lingual, particularly those that impose a liability. The existence and currency of both Hindi and Urdu side by side need not be dreaded as a counterpart of the Czech and the German languages in Czechoslovakia leading inevitably to the same results!

The Muslims' Grievances and their Remedies

- (a) GRIEVANCE—That “the Congress Ministries attempted to impart education at school in the vernacular of the provinces concerned. An overwhelming majority of the Muslims of India speak and read Urdu and that is their mother-tongue. The Muslims of these minority provinces further point out that if their children are forced to receive education through the medium of a vernacular which is not their mother tongue, not only cultural degeneration will set in among them but they will also be placed at a disadvantage in competition with the boys of other communities who are fortunate enough to receive their education in their own mother tongue.” As an instance, it is stated that “the Muslims in Orissa and the Maharatti-speaking districts of the Central Provinces and Berar look with alarm at the proposal of introducing Oriya and Maharatti as medium of instruction without including Urdu as one of the media. They point out that a Muslim will have to learn Oriya, Maharatti or any other vernacular, as the case may be, in addition to English and Urdu, his own mother tongue.”
(page 34, Pirpur)

REMEDY — That, as a rule, Urdu should invariably be included as one of the mediums for imparting education, side by side with other mediums, in all schools run by local bodies.

- (b) GRIEVANCE—That “the Provincial Governments and local bodies had shown unwillingness to open Urdu schools where the number of Muslim boys of school-going age justified the existence of such schools.”
(Pirpur, p. 34)

For instance, in the Central Provinces and Berar, “the Muslims generally complain of want of Urdu schools even in districts as Saugor and Mandla where the number of Muslims is enough to justify the opening of such schools. In high schools the medium of instruction is Hindi or Marathi. It is reported that some Municipal Boards abolished Urdu classes, while one refused grant to a secondary Urdu school”
(page 56, Pirpur):

while in Orissa, “the Muslims are economically poor and educationally backward. They have not many schools of their own. In primary schools children are allowed to choose either of the two languages,

Oriya and Urdu. But in aided schools only Oriya is recognised as the medium of instruction and no provision is made for Muslim students who want to learn Urdu language. Even in several Government schools attempts have been made and are being made to force the Muslim students to take up the Oriya language and numerous complaints have been made to us of indirect pressure being brought upon the Muslims to fall in. The arrangements for the teaching of Urdu are almost negligible. Out of a total number of 181 schools in the province, there is only one institution in which the medium of instruction is Urdu. This places the Muslim students at a disadvantage in competitions with other students in as much as the Muslims have to learn one more language in addition to Urdu and English." (Pirpur, page 96).

REMEDY — That Urdu schools should invariably and automatically be opened by local bodies wherever the number of Muslim children of school-going age justifies the existence of such schools.

Where the number of such Muslim children does not justify the opening of separate Urdu schools, it should be arranged that at the local schools one or more Urdu-knowing teachers as may be necessary, and available are included in the school staff whose duty it would be to impart education to the Muslim children in their own mother tongue, namely, Urdu.

The municipal and local boards as also the provincial government should encourage the employment of Urdu-knowing teachers on school staffs by offering special pay or such other inducements to secure an adequate in-flow of such qualified teachers as would be sufficient to meet the local requirements.

Where the number of Muslim children of school-going age is not sufficient to justify the opening of an Urdu school, if in such a case there happens to be no general school available in the neighbourhood where these children could go and where instruction in Urdu could be imparted to them under the above arrangement, the Mullah of the local mosque should be entrusted with the primary education of the local Muslim children, remunerated by a suitable grant from the local body concerned: such Mullahs should with suitable scholarships be encouraged to receive a course of training at the district or provincial Training School for Teachers.

The above arrangement proposed in the case of Muslims should, in similar circumstances, apply *mutatis mutandis* in the case of Hindus as well, Hindi being substituted for Urdu, the temple for the mosque, and the Brahman or the Pundit for the Mullah.

(c) GRIEVANCE—That in Madras, “one of the most important recommendations of the Committee appointed by the previous Government was the introduction of religious instruction for Muslims in schools and colleges. That Government accepted this recommendation along with others but in the name of economy, a good number of Muslim schools are now being closed down.” (Pirpur, page 93).

That in the Central Provinces, Moulvi Abdul Haq, in a letter to Mahatma Gandhi, published in the New Times, dated September 20 1938, says: “The Indian National Congress makes so much of its promise to safeguard the language and cultural interests of the minorities. That being so, you will feel shocked to know what a representative of my Anjuman had to witness at the village school of Pandharna in the district of Chindwara. Before the day’s work was begun in that school, the Muslim boys had to offer, with folded hands, along with the Hindu boys, *Parasthana* before the image of the goddess Saraswati. It was found that the Muslim boys were not to wish each other in their usual Islamic way, but to say Namaste and Ramji-ki-jai. I ask you is this safeguarding the interest of our language and culture ?” (Pirpur, p. 54).

The Committee further expressed themselves to be at a loss to understand how the temporal character of education was to be maintained with the inclusion of prayers. (Pirpur, page 33).

NOTE—Re: ‘PARASTHANA’ — The correct term is ‘PRASTHANA’, which means ‘going forth,’ ‘setting forth,’ ‘procession,’ ‘departing,’ ‘an offering’.

According to the Hindu orthodox belief, when people have to go out on important work on a day, which their astrologers have declared to be inauspicious, they go and leave at the house of some Brahmin something as *Prasthana*, for instance, a cap, a dhoti, or a sacred thread, with the object of averting the evil effects which may otherwise result from the inauspicious character of the day. In the case referred to above, namely, the *Prasthana* before Saraswati, the term obviously was used in the sense of an ‘offering’ before starting with the day’s work.

Saraswati is the goddess of Learning, and the prayer addressed to her before commencing the day’s work at a school would be to invoke her blessings on the pupils that their minds might be broadened with knowledge and learning. Of course we all know that the Hindu religion in essence is monotheistic, that the Hindu Pantheon is but descriptive of the various manifestations of the Godhead, that the image is but the visible mark through which the Hindus remember Him—their qiblah, which Hughes’ Dictionary of Islam describes to

mean 'anything opposite': just as the qiblah for our Muslim brothers is the direction of Holy Makkah, just as we Parsees have, as our qiblah, our Fire, the Sun, the Moon, or the Elements, so do our Hindu brothers have their images. It is not the qiblah to which prayer is offered: it is the One Godhead, our Common CREATOR, that we adore through the qiblah before us. Thus the Hindus' Prasthana is offered not to the symbol, the qiblah, the image of Saraswati, but through the qiblah to God Almighty, the All-knowing, who alone is the source and the giver of all knowledge to all His devotees whether they be Muslims or Hindus, Christians or Parsees.

There would thus be nothing wrong or objectionable if non-Hindu children took part in the Prasthana along with Hindu children. It would, however, be conceivable that Muslim parents might not deem the ceremonial to be suitable for their children of impressionable age. Besides, what would be objectionable would be that such participation should have been made compulsory for non-Hindu children, as the wording of the Pirpur Report suggests to have been the case. Muslim parents would be perfectly justified in objecting to such compulsion for which there could possibly be no excuse whatever. If such compulsion was applied at Pandharna, it was at best an evidence of misplaced zeal on the part of the authorities concerned, and, in any case, highly reprehensible.

As such ceremonial and prayers in mixed schools are likely to cause misunderstanding between our Muslim and Hindu brothers, it would be advisable and necessary in the interests of harmonious relations that all ceremonials, prayers, and matters pertaining to religion, such as religious instruction, should be entirely eliminated from the curriculum of all schools maintained from public funds.

As regards the *salutation*, this too appears to be a case of misunderstanding resulting from misplaced zeal. If we were to examine the meaning of the Hindu and the Muslim terms of salutation, we would find that both are harmless and freely interchangeable. The Hindu terms as quoted in the Pirpur Report were

NAMASTE I bow to you.

RAMJI-KI-JAI Success be to God.

The ordinary Muslim salutation is

As-Salmu 'alai-kum The peace be on you.

And the usual reply is

Wa 'alai-kum.

as-Salam And on you also be the Peace.

(Hughes' Dictionary of Islam, p. 563)

There would thus appear to be nothing in any of these forms to which one could take exception. What was objectionable, was that Muslim boys were not allowed to greet each other in their own Islamic way, but were made to use Hindu terms. Not the salutation, but the compulsion, was certainly objectionable and highly reprehensible.

REMEDY

That with a view to maintaining the secular character of education and in order to secure that all suggestion of religious discrimination should be scrupulously eliminated from all educational institutions, no religious instruction whatever, whether to Hindu students or to Muslim students, should be imparted at any school maintained from public funds. If the Hindus or the Muslims desire that religious instruction should be imparted to their children, it should be arranged for by them at their own mandirs or mosques through their Brahmins and Pundits or Moulvis and Mullahs, such instruction having no connection whatever with the schools maintained from the public funds.

Similarly, prayers should be entirely eliminated from the school curriculum in all schools maintained from the public funds.

That in the matter of salutations, the Muslim and Hindu students, at the schools maintained from the public funds, should be at liberty to follow their own respective forms of salutation, if they so desire: there should be no restriction of any kind as to the form to be used: a Muslim student should be free to use either the Muslim or the Hindu form: similarly a Hindu student should be free to use either the Hindu or the Muslim form.

- (d) GRIEVANCE—That “there are many Muslim secondary schools under private management which can only exist on equipment grant from Government. Such grants have been denied to these schools in the Madras Presidency, although the same Government has given a grant of several lakhs to the Pachorppas College, a purely Hindu institution, whose doors are completely closed to Muslim students. Even with regard to the Muslim orphanage similar treatment is meted out.” (Pirpur, page 93).

REMEDY — That grants-in-aid from the public funds to educational institutions should be made without discrimination on communal lines, and wholly on the basis of equality between the communities, the only guiding considerations being:

- (1) that the children of all the communities should have equal opportunities and equal facilities for acquiring education: and
- (2) that the needs of primary education should invariably have precedence over those of secondary and higher education.

The withdrawal of grants from schools in favour of a communal college would be a measure that on the face of it could be supported on no ground whatever.

- (e) **GRIEVANCE**—That in the Madras Presidency “admission of Muslim students in arts and professional colleges in the province used to be very difficult till the last Government appointed selection committees, including a Muslim representative on them. The selection committees were able to secure admission of Muslim students into these colleges. The Congress Government has abolished these selection committees with the result that admission of Muslim students is considerably restricted.” (Pirpur, page 93).

REMEDY—That such selection committees with Muslim representatives should be set up again to ensure that the Muslims have a fair share of admissions to the Colleges.

- (f) **GRIEVANCE**—That in the Madras Presidency “the Malabar District Board by a resolution, which it recently passed, resolved upon a ten-year plan for amalgamation of all special schools with general schools, with the result that after ten years no Moplah school will be in existence.

Then the Standing Committee of the District Board of Malabar at its meeting held on August 5, 1938, decided to abolish 73 schools on the ground that they were uneconomic. Of these, as many as 58 are Moplah schools. If sufficient opportunity had been given to these schools to justify their existence perhaps none of them would have been abolished. The proposal of the Committee has been approved by the District Board.” (Pirpur, pages 93-94).

- REMEDY**—That while amalgamation of special schools with general schools may be justifiable on economic grounds, such amalgamation should, in the general interests, be restricted to non-Muslim special schools: that all Moplah, and other Muslim, schools, closed so far, should be re-opened within a specified time: and that no Moplah, and other Muslim, schools should be closed on any grounds except with the consent of the local Muslim community.

- (g) **GRIEVANCE**—That in the Madras Presidency. “Under an order from the Government the Malabar District Board abolished the posts of Conductors and Conductresses in Moplah schools. These persons were part-time teachers of Quran in the schools and also effective propagandists for attracting pupils to the schools. Their abolition has worked as a great set-back to the increase of Moplah pupils, specially Moplah girls.

There are Arabic Pandits in some of the High Schools under the Malabar District Board. Some months back the Board issued an order to the effect that ten (sic) posts of these Pandits would be

abolished in all schools which have less than 20 students in the secondary stage, knowing full well that the Moplahs are extremely backward in the matter of secondary education and that the minimum insisted on by the Board would never be secured in most of the schools." (Pirpur, page 94).

REMEDY — That it is essential and desirable that education among these backward people should be encouraged and advanced and not retarded: that since the abolition of the posts of Conductors and Conductresses in Moplah schools has resulted in a fall in the number of Moplah pupils, especially girls, these posts should be revived as a special case in the special circumstances of the Moplah community: for the same reasons, the posts of Arabic Pandits which have been abolished should be revived: and it should be ensured that during the life of the Treaty of Perpetual Peace and Concord between the Muslims and the Hindus of United India, as a matter of general policy, no posts of Conductors, Conductresses, and Arabic Pandits should be reduced, and at the same time steps should be taken by the District Local Board, with such financial assistance from the Madras Government as may be necessary, to accelerate the pace of education among this community to enable it to be sufficiently equipped educationally to be able to take its rightful share in the affairs of the District along with the other communities.

(h) **GRIEVANCE** — That in the Bombay Presidency, "applications for exemption from fees in schools are generally invited at the beginning of the session and all those who secure exemption enjoy it for the whole academic year. At Chiloda, Ahmedabad District, these exemptions were granted in the month of June, 1937, and among the recipients were several Muslim pupils. But after the communal tension in the locality during the month of September 1937, all the students were asked to apply afresh and the previous exemptions were cancelled. As a result of this extraordinary procedure all the Hindu students retained their freeships as their case was recommended by the members of the School Committee, while the applications of the Muslim boys were rejected because they were not recommended by the members of the School Committee. It is needless for us to point out what hardship this uncalled for procedure caused to the parents of the Muslim students." (Pirpur, p. 69).

REMEDY — Presumably, there must be a satisfactory explanation for this extraordinary procedure which otherwise it would be difficult to defend. However, there can be no question as to what the right procedure would be. The guiding principles should be

(1) that there should be no discrimination on communal grounds:

- (2) that all benefits should be distributed between the communities evenly.

(i) GRIEVANCE — That in the Central Provinces and Berar, "the whole of the Betul District has been converted into a compulsory education area. The Government has provided for expenditure with the express condition that medium of instruction will be only Hindi. Thus the whole population of a district is being systematically converted into a Hindi-speaking population." (Pirpur, pages 56-7).

That in the same Province, "The Government admits that there is not a single Urdu school throughout the rural area of Saugor District, while there are only five Urdu schools in urban area. Five schools situated in a city cannot satisfy the education of the whole district. This is another district where the Muslims are converted into Hindi-speaking population at the cost of their language and culture" (Pirpur, page 57).

REMEDY — The Report does not state the strength of the Muslim population in the rural area of Saugor District, but whether it be large or small, the obvious remedy would be to adopt Urdu as a medium of instruction side by side with Hindi, subject to the arrangements suggested under (b) above.

(j) GRIEVANCE — The Pirpur Report reproduces at pages 58-9 "a circular letter from the Chairman, Local Board, Chandwar, which is one of the glaring examples of the method adopted by the local bodies under the Congress regime to systematically force Hindu culture and religion on Muslims in minority provinces. The fact that the Chairman of a Local Board asked the Head Masters of Urdu schools (where Muslims are in overwhelming majorities) to have the worship of an image (*tuswir*) of Mahatma Gandhi as part of the birthday celebrations, shows how callous the Congress is of the religious sentiments of the Muslims whose religious rights are supposed to be safe in the Karachi Congress resolution on minority rights." (Pirpur, page 57).

REMEDY — As has been recommended above, all religious instruction, including the offering of prayers, should be eliminated from schools; similarly, all hero-worship should also be eliminated.

(k) GRIEVANCE — VIDDIA MANDIR SCHEME—

"The word Mandir in common parlance means a place of idol worship. As such the very name goes against the grain of Islamic tenets and becomes repulsive to a Muslim. Knowing all this fully well, it is surprising how the great champions of Indian nationalism, the Congress Ministers, could give such a communal and anti-Islamic name to a scheme of education which is meant for the children of

all communities. According to the Scheme: "every village or group of villages within a radius of a mile having no schools and where about 40 boys and girls of school-going age are available shall have a Viddia Mandir. In all Viddia Mandirs, education shall be through the medium of the mother-tongue. We shall have, therefore, Marathi Viddia Mandirs, Hindi Viddia Mandirs and Urdu Viddia Mandirs, according to the needs and circumstances of the residents of each place where Viddia Mandirs are founded."

In theory the scheme does not neglect Urdu but in actual practice Urdu has been entirely extinguished. According to the scheme the schools will be founded within a radius of one mile if 40 boys and girls of school-going age are available and the schools will be according to the needs and circumstances of the residents of each place.

In a province like Central Provinces, where the Muslims are only four per-cent. of the total population, will it be possible to have Urdu Viddia Mandirs under the Scheme?

It is stated on behalf of the scheme:

'The name is attractive in more ways than one. To 99 per cent. of the population in villages, it will be a source of inspiration, and it is hoped that it will appeal to their generous and charitable minds.'

Considering the proportion of the Muslim population in the rural areas it is clear from the above quotation that the scheme is meant for the benefit of the majority community only and the appeal to the generous and charitable minds of the 99 per cent. of the total population in village is purely of a communal nature.

The scheme has already been elaborately criticised and commented upon by eminent educationists like Maulana Abdul Haque and others, so there is no need for us to say anything further." (Pirpur, pages 59-60).

REMEDY — The minimum number of children required for such a school in the case of Muslims should be reduced to 15 or such other figure as may be determined by the local authorities in consultation with the local Muslims.

Such schools for the Muslims should be called **Maktabs** or **Madressahs**, and not **Viddia Mandirs**.

If the number of Muslim children does not come up to the above minimum, arrangements for their instruction through the local **Mullah** should be provided as suggested under (b). above.

(l) GRIEVANCE — That "text-books prescribed at present for study deal exclusively with the glories of Hindu divinities and Hindu heroes and saints; and contain no reference to the cultural and social achievements of the Muslims or to any historic names held in veneration by them. The grievance of the Muslims is not that these text-books deal with Hindu heroes or Hindu great men, but that they do not speak of the Muslims at all. This is not a way to evolve a single nationality (and) build up a common culture." (Pirpur, page 35).

REMEDY — That text-books should be revised or re-written with a view to ensuring that the complaint regarding unequal treatment in the matter of references to divinities, saints, heroes, etc., of the two communities is eliminated, and that such references in all text-books should be given on a footing of equality thus doing equal justice to both the communities.

(m) GRIEVANCE — That "applications written in Urdu are rejected by the municipal boards in the Central Provinces and Berar." (Pirpur, pages 35 & 56).

REMEDY — That applications written in Urdu should in no case be rejected. Arrangements should invariably be made by all bodies for dealing with such applications and for replies being sent out in Urdu.

(n) GRIEVANCE — That "in Bihar, although the use of Urdu script is allowed, the courts usually insist on the presentation of a copy written in the Hindi script." (Pirpur, pages 35 & 43).

REMEDY — That all courts should make adequate arrangements for dealing with documents written in the Urdu script and that copies in the Hindi script should not be insisted upon.

(o) GRIEVANCE — That "in the Legislative Assembly of Central Provinces and Berar, the speeches of members who speak in Urdu are reported either in Hindi script or only a summary of their speeches is reported in English." (Pirpur, pages 35 & 56).

REMEDY — That adequate arrangements should invariably be made in all Legislatures for reporting Urdu speeches in the Urdu script.

The above REMEDIES would be bound to involve expenditure on the provision and maintenance of additional staff and other necessary facilities, but, as observed earlier, the proposed measures would be calculated to remove or neutralise an active source of misunderstanding and discontent on the part of the Muslims, and in view of the great importance of securing this most desirable result, it would be essential and in the interests of both the great communities that this additional expenditure should be willingly and readily provided as an obligatory duty imposed by law on all local and public bodies concerned.

Section (v) THE NATIONAL ANTHEM FOR INDIA

The Congress governments had adopted the BANDE MATARAM song as the National Anthem for India. The Muslims contend that the song is

detrimental to Muslim nationalism, being not only idolatrous, but also in its origin and conception a hymn of hate towards the Muslims (a): and they object to its being sung at mixed gatherings, schools, etc., where Muslims may be present.

The following resolution was adopted by the All-India Muslim League at its sessions at Lucknow in 1937:

"This meeting of the All-India Muslim League strongly condemns the attitude of the Congress in foisting Bande Mataram as the national anthem upon the country in callous disregard of the feelings of Muslims and considers this song not merely positively anti-Islamic and idolatrous in its inspiration and ideas, but definitely subversive of the growth of genuine nationalism in India.

This Meeting further calls upon the Muslim members of the various Legislatures and public bodies in the country not to associate themselves in any manner with the highly objectionable song."

The Congress Working Committee issued a lengthy statement on the song in October, 1937 and ultimately decided to recommend that certain stanzas, which contained allegorical references, may not be used on the national platform. It is further claimed that the two stanzas recommended as the National Song do not contain a word or phrase that will offend anybody.

By excluding certain lines from the 'National Song' the Congress High Command has conceded the League's contention that Bande Mataram at least does contain objectionable passages. They must, however, realise that the Muslims cannot forget the historical background of the song and the sentiments that led to its composition.

Further, in support of the song it is stated that Bande Mataram has been associated with Indian nationalism for more than thirty years and numerous associations of sentiments and sacrifices have gathered round it and that no objection was taken to it, except on political grounds, by the Government. To our mind, the defence exposes the narrow and predominantly communal nature of the nationalism proclaimed by the Congress. The fact that the British Government objected to the song on merely political grounds only goes to prove the League's contention that the religious import of the song is directed against the Muslims alone.

We cannot help wondering that if popular songs are not made to order and cannot be successfully imposed, why, since the acceptance of office by the Congress, Bande Mataram is being thrust upon the impressionable boys in schools. We may here point out that before the acceptance of office by the Congress this song was recited at meetings held under the aegis of the Congress and those who attended them were there out of their own free will. As such there was no occasion for objection. But now the position has changed. The Congress now forms the Government in seven provinces of India. Congressmen and their sympathisers have started singing the song at public meetings and other functions where members of different religions have to be present.

Moreover, the various Congress Governments have lifted the ban on the song in Government schools. The reason given was that since

(a) Vide the Resolution adopted by the First Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference, 1938, at page 9 ante.

the ban was imposed by the Government of the pre-Reform days, and was directed against Indian nationalism it had to be lifted. The effect of this order has been, however, quite different. School teachers, keen on winning the favour of the new masters, have taken it upon themselves to make the singing of Bande Mataram a permanent feature of the school curriculum. To mention only a few examples, the Muslim students of Patna objected to the singing of the song and went on strike. The school management compelled some of the students to leave the school. The Muslim public of Patna had to open a separate school to save the careers of these boys from being totally ruined. Then in the Central Provinces the Muslim students have the same grievance against the Municipal schools. In the Normal school at Wardha the Muslim students are not allowed to touch the food in the school mess, are forced to stand with folded hands when Bande Mataram is sung and made to live entirely on vegetarian diet. All this only shows a callous disregard of the feelings and sentiments of the Muslims by the Congress Governments." (a)

It is unnecessary to give here and discuss the text of the song, its origin, the associations of sentiments and sacrifices that have gathered around it. For our purposes it is sufficient to note that the Muslims resent it keenly: we have to take note of the resentment and see whether and how it can be allayed or removed.

The question is simple. Here is a song which the Hindus desire to adopt as the National Anthem for India. The Muslims object to it. The Hindus have not produced another which would be acceptable to the Muslims. The Muslims have not produced one that would be acceptable to the Hindus. If our common aim is the achievement of unity, where would be the sense in one party persisting in a course which is repugnant to the other?

But the question of questions is—where is the Nation for which we seek to have a National Anthem? Are we Free yet? Are slaves to have a song? Of what? Can songs create a nation? Will songs—call them National Anthems or whatever else you like—bring Freedom? My friends, until Freedom is won, what we want is not a song—we want a few crisp words of solemn affirmation, declaring our unbending will and firm resolve to win Freedom—an affirmation that could be repeated by Hindus and Muslims, Sikhs, Christians and Parsees, alike, without any infringement of their religious scruples or sentiments, which, reflecting as it would do their natural urge and longing for Freedom, could be repeated freely by one and all from the deepest recesses of their hearts—which could be repeated by Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Savarkar, without any compunction or mental reservation—an affirmation withal that could not be repeated too often. I shall suggest such an affirmation at the end of this Note. If adopted, I would suggest that it be translated in all provincial languages, and to meet the susceptibilities of our Muslim and Hindu friends on the question of language, I would suggest the following procedure as regards its use at gatherings, etc., where the Bande Mataram or any other similar song is now sung as a national anthem:—

The chairman should read out the Affirmation, or have it read out

firstly, in the language of the province;

secondly, in Urdu;

thirdly, in Hindi;

lastly, in English.

If it is a purely communal gathering, then in the language of the community.

As regards the Affirmation, I would suggest the following as a specimen:—

WE SOLEMNLY REAFFIRM OUR FIRM RESOLVE,
UNBENDING WILL, AND INFLEXIBLE DETERMINATION
TO WIN FREEDOM FOR OUR COUNTRY.
THROUGH DISTRUST AND DISUNITY WE HAVE BEEN RESPONSIBLE
FOR PROLONGING THE BONDAGE OF OUR COUNTRY.
WE ARE DETERMINED TO TRUST OUR BROTHERS.
UNITEDLY WE SHALL STRIVE FOR FREEDOM:
UNITEDLY WE SHALL WIN FREEDOM.
WE SOLEMNLY PLEDGE OURSELVES BEFORE GOD
WE SHALL NOT REST TILL WE HAVE WON FREEDOM.
SO HELP US GOD!
LONG LIVE OUR INDIA.

Section (vi)—THE NATIONAL FLAG FOR INDIA

The following extracts from the Rirpur Committee's Report give the Muslim viewpoint in the matter of the National Flag for India:—

"The Muslims believe that the tricolour of the Congress is purely a party flag and nothing more. Every political party, whether in office or in the opposition, has the right to hoist its flag wherever it likes. While, on most of the Municipal and District Board buildings the Congress flag has been hoisted without any opposition from the Muslims, whenever any local body, with a Muslim majority, has passed a resolution for the hoisting of the Muslim League flag, the members of the majority community, confident of the Congress Government's support have put obstacles in the way of the resolution being enforced. It has been claimed by them that their objection to the League flag is based on the fact that it is a communal flag. We should like to know if the foisting of the so-called national flag on the unwilling minorities is anything but an expression of the narrow communalism of the majority community.

It is argued on behalf of the Congress that the tricolour contains the Muslim green. But without a change of heart, without a settlement of the points in dispute and without unity of purpose between the two communities the inclusion of the Muslim colour in the Congress flag is meaningless. The flag should represent the true feelings and sentiments of the Muslim community if it is to have any significance at all, but unfortunately it does not.

Since the Congress has come into power the hoisting of the tricolour over public buildings has become another source of friction between the two communities. There have been instances where the flag has been hoisted without the sanction of the proper authority. We may, however, point out that a national flag cannot be forced upon unwilling people any more than a national anthem. Such attempts would only expose the latent communal nature of the 'national' policy of the party, which is overwhelmingly Hindu." (Pirpur, pp. 22-23).

"As to how the atmosphere in the educational institutions (in Bihar) has been vitiated by over-zealous schoolmasters will be apparent from a statement of Syed Abdul Aziz, Bar-at-Law, a former Minister:—

"Muslim students sincerely and whole-heartedly intended to participate in the meeting convened to inaugurate the scheme for

mass-literacy. They joined the procession on the assurance by some teachers and headmasters that no flag of political significance would be carried, no political slogan raised and no political song would be sung on this occasion which was purely of an educational character and was of common interest to all classes of people, irrespective of religion or political creed.

This assurance, however, came to be broken no sooner than it was given, as some Hindu students began to unfurl Congress flags and shout *Bande Mataram*, which caused the Muslim students to say *Allah-o-Akbar*. By the time the procession arrived at the Science College excitement became intense and violence broke out." (Pirpur, page 38).

"In the United Provinces there have been many disputes at various places regarding the hoisting of the Congress flag on public buildings.

It became the general tendency among local bodies to pass resolutions in favour of hoisting the Congress or Muslim League flag on public buildings. In the Municipal Board of Cawnpore the Muslims raised a storm of protest when orders were issued asking all aided institutions to hoist the Congress flag on their buildings on pain of forfeiting their grants-in-aid. On the other hand, when in the Municipal Board of Bareilly a resolution was passed that the League flag be hoisted on Municipal building difficulties were placed in the way of hoisting the flag." (Pirpur, page 72).

In Karachi, a gathering of schoolboys was organised during 1942 as part of a Communal Unity programme. The hoisting of flags was not on the programme, yet some Hindu boys hoisted the Congress tricolour which evoked opposition from Muslim boys who pulled down the Congress flag and hoisted the League flag. The confusion and disturbance that followed compelled the organisers to break up the gathering without going through the programme fixed for the occasion.

It will be seen from the above that there is no unanimity over the flag question which, like the song question, has been responsible for recurring friction between the communities.

I suggest that in adopting flags, holding hoisting ceremonies, and marching past flagstuffs, we are only playing, like children, with toys. Only free peoples have flags, the emblems of their freedom, supported by their national might. Do slaves have flags? Your flags can be banned by the authorities of the day—what sanction do your flags have behind them?

As I write this (25th April, 1943), I see in the papers that Mr. Jinnah performed the flag-hoisting ceremony at New Delhi on the opening day of the 30th Session of the All India Muslim League (24-4-43), that there was a march-past of volunteers to the accompaniment of a band from Sind, and that Mr. Jinnah took the salute. If Pakistan had been in operation, the ceremony could have had a meaning. But, Chaman-i-Pakistan was not Pakistan, nor was Mr. Jinnah any the less of a slave, any the nearer freedom, while he stood below his flag taking the salute from brother slaves. As it was, in his address that followed the ceremonial, Mr. Jinnah had "to inform the British Government that the bitterness and disappointment at the shabby treatment meted out to Muslim India is a danger to them (the British Government) (Cheers!)". A flag, and 'shabby treatment'! mutually so incompatible! The 'treatment' was the indicator of the power of the flag! For all the power it commands, if your flag is banned by the ruling authority tomorrow, you will neatly fold it up and put it away! Is such a flag any use other than as a toy? And in quarrelling over such flags are we not behaving exactly like children quarrelling over toys? Placed as we are today, it would seem that the only flag that both Muslims and

Hindus could appropriately and unitedly claim and be eligible for would be a black flag with the legend inscribed thereon "WE SHALL NEVER UNITE!" A minute devoted to introspection, during the hoisting ceremony of this flag, might perchance awaken us to the realities around us!

My friends, let us realise that in our altercations over the flag and the song, as over other matters already discussed, we are making a ludicrous exhibition of ourselves, our commonsense, our sense of proportion. That Indians may have a flag of their own when India has achieved freedom would be conceivable. That Muslims may have a flag of their own in Pakistan when Pakistan has materialised, would also be conceivable. But, until then, for Hindus and Muslims to have separate flags for themselves while India continues in bondage, would be simply ludicrous.

My friends, I know that these ceremonials have an up-lifting effect on many of those present: but, to many others they are nothing more than a tamasha. The song and the flag may have a value and utility if they could produce unity. The results, however, we know, have been exactly the opposite. In these hard days, with harder ones ahead, it would be foolish to waste our time and breath in singing songs, hoisting flags, marching-past with bands. Every rising sun brings a hard day's work for each one of us. We must devote to the performance of our day's duties, to the completion of our day's task, all our time, all our energy, all of our honest best, so that, in our individual sphere, to our individual capacity, we may be able to make our due contribution in advancement of our country's cause. In these hard times demanding unremitting hard work from each one of us, there can be no time to waste over meaningless ceremonials. There can be no time to waste over singing anthems that are anathema to your neighbours; on hoisting flags that are red rags to them; and in carrying on endless altercation thereon. If you feel like joining in and making speeches for or against, have a good run and that will knock all your grand speeches out of you: if you feel like taking up the fight with your pen, put your pen in the fire: it might cost you an anna, but your country would benefit in that you would have been prevented from widening the gulf with your lucubrations. Put away your flags, my friends, put them away—bury them ten fathoms deep: and with them bury also all memories of the past: we have had enough of the toys: we do not want flags: we do not want anthems: we do not want tamashas: these will not bring us freedom: we want what can bring us freedom: we want freedom. We would love to salute our Jinnah and his flag with every breath of our life, but we want him to be a 'free' Jinnah, not Jinnah the slave: we want his flag to be the flag of the 'free': we want to salute a 'free' Jinnah and his 'free' flag as 'free' men ourselves. Let us win our Freedom first, Mr. Jinnah, Mr. Savarkar; then every free man will be a Flag of Freedom unto himself.

Section (vii) INTER-COMMUNAL SOCIAL INTERCOURSE

The following extracts from "PAKISTAN AND UNTOUCHABILITY" by Ch. Afzal Haq will give an idea of the Muslim view-point:—

"The meek and unmilitant Hindu who is very broad-minded in religion, at once turns round with his tail up if he once enters the social field. He changes colour and begins to show his teeth if you dare to go near him. If a Muslim aristocrat in a princely dress goes to a Hindu confectioner to buy some sweetmeats, he has to stand at a respectable distance or he has to get a stern rebuke from the shopkeeper. Dare a Muslim touch the confectioner's hand when giving him the price? No, he has to stretch out his hand with palm up to receive the sweetmeats which will be thrown from some height by the confectioner so that his body may not be polluted by the touch of the

“.....Politics did not interest the Muslim rank and file. ‘Religion in danger’ had also no meaning to them because there was little or no difference between Hindu Dharma and the Islam of India. However, the social treatment of Hindus excited them to anger. Though this treatment was not a new phenomenon, yet this era of individual liberty brought about a little consciousness in the Muslim masses. They were dormant but not dead. The British efforts in the field of politics and Arya Samaj activities in the field of religion excited anti-Hindu passions in the Muslim masses. The Muslim intelligentsia and the puritan Mussalmans played an important part in creating this strong feeling. Mussalmans of the Aryan race, Mussalmans of the Sufi cult, Mussalmans of the High Houses, Mussalmans of good education were treated alike as untouchables by the Hindu Society. You may be a pucca nationalist and four-square Gandhi-ite, yet you will be treated as an untouchable as soon as you announce to a Hindu that you are a Musalman. However justified the Hindus feel and however innocent they plead in their treatment of the Mussalmans, in justice they cannot blame the latter if they cultivate an ill-feeling towards them.

“Muslim masses argue in a very simple way—‘Here is our Hindu neighbour who feels polluted by the very touch of our hand. What right has he to feel so. If he has such a right, why should we not pay him in the same coin.’ There ends their imagination. I know that a section of the Hindu society wants to see the ‘touch me not spirit’ to continue for ever, because in this way a superiority complex is developed in the Hindus and an inferiority complex is cultivated in the mind of the Musalman. This is a short-sighted view of the situation. Though Islam laughs at the racial or clannish pride, yet to counteract the Hindu view, Muslims are wilfully introducing a new pride based on a false notion of religion which will be ultimately disastrous to the peace of the country. They are using the Hindu ideology to gain their end. They say that a Hindu is a pagan therefore polluted; his touch will pollute a Muslim who is pure in body and soul. According to Islam all human beings are pure. The religious system of Islam does not rest upon birth, race or class. Yet they cleverly use religion to influence their community because religious hatred is the greatest

driving force and therefore an indispensable necessity in this case. Instead of taking up a defensive position and acting upon a constructive programme, passions are aroused at once and the boycott movement ends in Hindu-Muslim clashes." (a)

"The Muslim masses before the advent of the British Raj were inert and the classes being the governing class had their own pride and a sense of superiority over the Hindus, so there was no communal feeling in the community; hence there was no trouble." (b)

A shrewd analysis of the Muslim mind is given by Ch. Afzal Haq in the following passage :—

"I as a Mussalman gratefully appreciate the enthusiasm of Congress politicians to come to an understanding with the Muslims. But no political move will be crowned with success unless the social ban is lifted from the Mohammadans. As I have already stated Muslims badly feel the pinch of untouchability and social boycott by the Hindus. They will embrace every opportunity to pick up a quarrel with the Hindus because life is not after their heart on account of the treatment meted out to them. Mr. Jinnah is the apple of their eyes so long as he promises to fight against those who have kept them down. No sooner he comes to terms with Hindus, then he will be cried down as a traitor. The secret of leadership of the Muslim Masses lies in goading them to constant strife with Hindus. A life of poverty and ill-treatment at the hands of Hindus has made them desperate. They want to answer back injury for insult. Who does not know that poverty and ill-treatment belittle the mind and corrupt the spirit? Mohammadans think that Hindus are responsible for their woes. This is why they one day cheer a man to the echo but the next day when they find him friendly disposed towards Hindus, they despise him." (c)

"Popularity of Pakistan Scheme rests mainly on the treatment of (Muslims by) Hindus; if once the Hindu is reformed, no one will hear of Pakistan in this country." (d)

"We must get our liberty first and try for some time to honestly make up differences and effect a social and economical revolution. Every pound of our energy should be spent on making Indian people a classless society. After Swaraj Muslims will not tolerate to live for a moment as untouchables. Social degradation is more pinching than slavery." (e)

The Hindu is charged with treating the Muslim as an Untouchable. The Muslim resents it. It is asserted that the popularity of Pakistan rests mainly on this ill-treatment of the Muslim by the Hindu. It is admitted that in the great majority of such cases of ill-treatment, there is no ill-feeling behind it on the part of the Hindu. It is asserted that once the Hindu ceases to treat the Muslim as an Untouchable, no one will hear of Pakistan in this country.

There is the fact of ill-treatment on the part of one creating resentment on the part of the other; there is the fact of the resentment accentuating the desire for separation. If our Hindu friends are anxious to avoid separation involving the partitioning of the Country, their obvious course would appear to be to remove the root cause of the Muslim's resentment—the ill-treatment—the treatment as an Untouchable.

-
- (a) "PAKISTAN AND UNTOUCHABILITY" by Ch. Afzal Haq, pp. 55-6.
 (b) " " " " " " " p. 82.
 (c) " " " " " " " pp. 127-8.
 (d) " " " " " " " p. 143.
 (e) " " " " " " " p. 148.

In the Chapter addressed to my Muslim Friends (a), I have suggested the adoption of my Communal Formula (b) as a CODE OF CONDUCT to be observed mutually by the Muslims and the Hindus in their day to day life. There can be no laws and rules to impose and enforce the observance of the CODE. It would entirely be a matter of Honour for each man and woman, Hindu and Muslim, as between their Conscience and their Maker.

Similarly, in the case of the above grievance in the matter of social intercourse between the communities, there can be no hard and fast rule or law to govern men's conduct. In the case of the shopkeeper's instance above, it might be found helpful to provide in the shop license a suitable penalty as a check against such conduct: and Panchayats, where they exist, might also be able to help the good cause within their circle of influence. But, while such checks might prove helpful in these and similar cases, they would of course not cover the whole field of conduct between man and man in their day to day life, nor could they bring about a wholesale transformation of men's ideas in the matter of social intercourse, particularly when such mode of conduct happens to be backed by the sanction of age-long usage. Our present generations have been born and brought up in these usages, and it would be unreasonable to expect their transformation overnight. Yet, declarations by responsible Hindu Elders in every town and village extending to their Muslim neighbours an assurance of honourable treatment as between brothers in their social intercourse for the future, accompanied by appropriate injunctions enjoined on their co-religionists, might go some way in allaying the Muslims' resentment, and restoring harmonious relations between the communities.

A vast field of great and noble service lies here before you, my Young Hindu Friends. We need not delve into the past to ascertain whether our ancestors had any justification for such conduct. If there ever was such a phenomenon as a MALECHCHHA, that phenomenon exists no longer: similarly, the age of PAGANS-KAFFIRS—passed into oblivion long before we were born: both belonged to the age of the DODO: we have no Dodos now amongst us: neither have we any MALECHCHHAS and KAFFIRS: by our Creator's kindness we are all civilised humans: we know that we have all been created pure, not impure, equal, not unequal: we know that we humans have been created in His image, that our Creator, Who is all-pervading, pervades also the beings of both Hindus and Muslims alike. Let us realise that in insulting a fellow human we insult our Creator. What are we insignificant mortals that we should presume to dare insult our Creator in our fellow humans around us whether they be Muslims, Christians or Parsees?

The sweetmeat seller, who gave Ch. Afzal Haq the experience of a lifetime, can be found in every town and village in this great country, and so long as he exists, so long will exist the MALECHCHHAS of his imagination and belief, along with the KAFFIRS as their counterparts. A wise dispensation, however, has ordained that we humans should not be immortal. The sweetmeat sellers will go one day, and with them, let us hope and pray, will also go their MALECHCHHAS and the KAFFIRS. But while they are with us, dispensing sweetmeats to MALECHCHHAS in the approved traditional style, I would ask you, my Muslim brothers, to bear with them in patience, with fortitude and all the goodwill you can manage to muster, remembering all the while, as Ch. Afzal Haq has assured us, that there is *no* ill-feeling behind the ill-treatment.

It would, however, be for you, my Young Hindu Friends, to see to it that history is not allowed to repeat itself with the next generation of sweetmeat sellers! You

(a) Part VI, Chapter 5, "OUR MEN OF DESTINY."

(b) Part V, "8(B), "THE INDIA CHARTER."

can do more. Each one of you can be a reformer in your own little circle—be a messenger of hope and cheer to those around you. If I were you, I would make it a point of seeing to it that every time I meet a Muslim, be he a friend or a stranger, I would greet him with a cheery smile and a “*As-Salamu ‘alai-kum*” “**THE PEACE BE ON YOU.**” I would have at least one Muslim friend among my circle of friends, and cultivate brotherly relations with him. If he happens to have come across a sweetmeat seller—old style—I would accompany him to the shop, and in the presence of the confectioner I would take the sweets from the hands of my Muslim friend, apologise to my friend for the confectioner’s behaviour in the hearing of the latter and partake of sweets with my friend. If on a railway journey I hear porters shouting ‘Muslim Pani,’ ‘Hindu Pani,’ I would call for and take the ‘Muslim Pani’; and if a Muslim fellow traveller asks the Hindu porter for pani and if it is refused to him, I would take the ‘Hindu Pani’ and hand it to the Muslim traveller with my apologies for the porter’s behaviour. Such instances could be multiplied, and generally speaking I would so regulate my conduct towards my Muslim fellow countrymen that by my personal example I may help, to ever so small an extent, in easing the unfortunate tension that now prevails between the communities. It would be an up-hill task, it might take days and weeks and months and years to show tangible results, it might involve disparagement, derision, even an unkind knock now and again: but with self-discipline, determination and perseverance, with the sense of self-purification in atonement, keeping the goal of Brotherhood all the time in view, in the spirit of service to our Motherland. I should be sure of ultimate success, and—in the esteem and regard of my Muslim brother—of my eventual certain reward. This would be the task I would set to myself if I were one of you, my Young Hindu Friends. If you are man enough for the task, I call upon you, every one of you, to set this task to yourself, and, as men of honour, not to rest till you have seen it through and achieved success. This is the least service you can place at the feet of our Motherland. Will she look for it in vain?

I have suggested above that our Hindu Elders all over the Country might extend certain assurances to their Muslim neighbours. I would suggest the following as a specimen:

“We Hindus solemnly affirm that in our social intercourse with our Muslim neighbours we shall endeavour to the best of our ability invariably to treat them as our brothers as we would expect them to treat us as their brothers: and we shall honestly endeavour that in our intercourse with them we do not say or do anything, advertently, or inadvertently, that may, directly or indirectly, injure their feelings in any way.”

I would suggest that our Muslim friends accept the hand of fellowship so extended and reciprocate the gesture with, say:—

“We Muslims readily accept the assurances of fellowship offered by our Hindu brothers. Henceforth we shall be brothers to them as we expect them to be brothers to us: and may Allah bless our Brotherhood.”

Solemn assurances, honestly offered and honourably observed, can never fail to achieve their purpose. A great wrong—the heritage of centuries of social inequalities—awaits redress. In the task the Hindu Youth have their part to play, their duty to perform: so have the Hindu Elders. Our Motherland expects that her Hindu and Muslim sons make up their childhood differences, and mark their attainment of manhood with the above Solemn Assurances, to be honestly offered, to be honourably observed. Will it remain a vain expectation?

PART—IV
THE POLITICAL QUESTION
PAKISTAN

CHAPTER

WESTERN DEMOCRACY AND INDIAN MUSLIMS

Small Nation States

Extract from "HISTORY OF FREEDOM AND OTHER ESSAYS,"
by Lord Acton (a)

"The co-existence of several nations under the same state is a test as well as the best security of its freedom. The combination of different nations in one state is as necessary a condition of civilized life as the combination of men in society. Inferior races are raised by living in political union with races intellectually superior. Exhausted and decaying nations are revived by the contact of a younger vitality. The fertilizing and regenerating process can only be obtained by living under one government. It is in the cauldron of the State that the fusion takes place by which the vigour, the knowledge and the capacity of one portion of mankind may be communicated to another.

A nation can be vigorous and progressive when it is not the result of merely physical and material causes but a moral and a political being; not the creation of geographical and physiological unity but developed in the course of history by the action of the State. A State may in course of time produce a nationality but that a nationality should constitute a state is contrary to the nature of modern civilization.

Small nation states in order to maintain their integrity have to attach themselves by confederations or family alliances to Great Powers and thus lose something of their independence. Their tendency is to isolate and shut off their inhabitants, to narrow the horizon of their views and to dwarf in some degree the *proportion* of their ideas. Public opinion cannot maintain its liberty and purity in such small dimensions and the currents that come from larger communities sweep over a contracted territory. In a small homogeneous population there is hardly room for a natural classification of society or of inner groups of interests, that set bounds to sovereign power.

The government and the subjects contend with borrowed weapons. The resources of the one and the aspirations of the other are derived from some external source and the consequence is that the country becomes the instrument and scene of contests in which it is not interested."

The One Test of Democratic Governments

Extract from "THE COMMUNAL TRIANGLE IN INDIA" by Mehta & Patwardhan, pages 225-27:—

"Broadly then, it seems clear that the system of Parliamentary democracy such as that which has been developed and worked hitherto in England

(a) As reproduced at pages 151-2 of "THE COMMUNAL TRIANGLE IN INDIA" by Ashoka Mehta and Achyut Patwardhan.

(essentially on a two party system) is not likely to be suited to Indian needs—certainly not for the Central or Federal Government and probably not for the provinces either.” (a)

Sir George Schuster assumes above that a democratic government is possible only with a two-party system. There seems to be hardly any basis for this assumption. Even if we leave out the recent experience of parliamentary government in England, we could always point out to America where governments drawn from the same political party have functioned for a number of years together. But no one on that account has suggested that democracy is unsuited to America.

The one test of democratic governments would appear to be that if one government loses the confidence of the people or their elected representatives, it should be possible for an alternate government to take charge of the administration.”

Do away with Communal Parties

Extract from the Presidential Address of Dr. Paranjpye at the sessions of the National Liberal Federation, Allahabad, on 27-29 Dec., 1939 (b)

“Some modification of the rigorous party discipline seems to be called for if the injured feelings of Muslims and other minorities are to be allayed. It is not a great deviation even from the strict democratic practice of England, where in times of great stress all parties combine to form national governments without giving up their own fundamental principles. Cannot India try various new methods and work out a system which will best suit its own peculiar conditions? The one most important point is to bring various communities together on purely political and economic platforms and to do away with communal parties altogether. This can be done by winning each other's confidence. Riding the high horse on the strength of huge majorities is not the best way of attaining the object.”

Western Democracy Unsuitable for India

The following is an article by Mr. M. A. Jinnah, dated the 19th January, 1940, written for the “Time and Tide” and issued from New Delhi on the 13th February, 1940 which elaborates his thesis that Western democracy is totally unsuited for India and that its imposition on India is the disease in the body politic. He demands that a constitution must be evolved that recognises the existence of two nations in India, both of whom must share the governance of their common Motherland :— (c)

“The constitutional maladies from which India at present suffers may best be described as symptoms of a disease inherent in the body politic. Without diagnosing the disease, no understanding of the symptoms is possible. Let us, therefore, first diagnose the disease, then consider the symptoms and finally arrive at the remedy.

What is the political future of India? The declared aim of the British Government is that India should enjoy Dominion Status in accordance with the Statute of Westminster in the shortest practicable time. In order that

(a) “INDIA AND DEMOCRACY” by Sir George Schuster & Guy Wint, p. 376.

(b) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER 1939, Vol. II, pp. 292-93.

(c) “ ” ” ” 1940 “ I, ” 302-305.

this end should be brought about, the British Government, very naturally, would like to see in India the form of democratic constitution it knows best and thinks best, under which the government of the country is entrusted to one or other political party in accordance with the turn of the elections.

Such, however, is the ignorance about Indian conditions among even the members of the British Parliament that, in spite of all the experience of the past, it is even yet not realised that this form of government is totally unsuited to India. Democratic systems based on the concept of a homogeneous nation such as England are very definitely not applicable to heterogeneous countries such as India and this simple fact is the root cause of all India's constitutional ills. Even as Under-Secretary of State for India the late Lt.Col. Muirhead failed to appreciate this fact for, deploring the present communal tension, he expressed the opinion that the tendency on the part of both those in power and those in opposition was to consider that what the position now was would be the position always. He deplored the failure of Indians to appreciate an essential feature of democratic government—namely, the majority and minority are never permanent, and he, therefore, felt that the minorities' opposition to Federation on the assumption that, from the outset, power would be in the hands of an irremovable majority, was untenable. But he forgot that the whole concept of democracy postulates a single people, divided however much economically, and he might well have started his study of Indian problems by consulting the report of the Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms (sessions 1933-34, Vol. I, para 1).

‘India is inhabited by many races often as distinct from one another in origin, tradition and manner of life as are the nations of Europe. Two-thirds of its inhabitants profess Hinduism in one form or another as their religion, over 77 millions are followers of Islam; and the difference between the two is not only of religion in the stricter sense, but also of law and culture. They may be said, indeed, to represent two distinct separate civilizations. Hinduism is distinguished by the phenomenon of its caste which is the basis of its religious and social system and save in a very restricted field remains unaffected by contact with philosophies of the west; the religion of Islam on the other hand is based upon the conception of the equality of man.’

Perhaps no truer description of India has been compressed into a paragraph and without this background, no understanding of Indian problem is possible. The British people must realise that Hinduism and Islam ‘represent two distinct and separate civilisations’ and, moreover, are ‘as distinct from one another in origin, tradition and manner of life as are the nations of Europe.’

They are, in fact, two different nations and if this fact is accepted by no less an authority than the Joint Select Committee, the Muslim people have cause to question the wisdom of the British Government in forcing on India the western system of democracy without the qualifications and limitations to which the system must be subject to make it at all suitable for Indian conditions. If, therefore, it is accepted that there is in India a major and a minor nation, it follows that a parliamentary system based on the majority principle must inevitably mean the rise of the major nation. Experience has proved that, whatever the economic and political programme of any political party, the Hindu, as a general rule, will vote for his caste-fellow and the Muslim for his co-religionist. The British people, being Christians, sometimes forget the religious wars of their own history and today consider religion as a private and personal matter between man and God. This can never be

the case in Hinduism and Islam, for both these religions are definite social codes which govern not so much man's relation with his God as man's relation with his neighbour. They govern not only his law and culture but every aspect of his social life and such religions, essentially exclusive, completely preclude that merging of identity and unity of thought on which the western democracy is based and inevitably bring about vertical rather than the horizontal divisions democracy envisages. Western democracy is totally unsuited for India and its imposition on India is the disease in the body politic.

Let us now consider the inevitable symptoms. Led by an astute Hindu politician of the first rank, Mr. Gandhi, the Congress (which is mainly a Hindu body) had long foreseen that in the western form of democracy lay the fulfilment of their hopes of a permanent all-India dominance. All their efforts and energies had, therefore, been bent towards securing for India a completely democratic form of government and they realised that the new constitution would bring their goal immeasurably nearer if it could be worked on the lines chalked out by their leader and the working committee. Therefore, while crying that the new constitution was thoroughly unsatisfactory and totally unacceptable, the Congress decided to contest the elections held before its inauguration and, as was inevitable, secured complete majorities in the six Hindu provinces of India namely, Bombay, Madras, the U.P., the C. P., Bihar and Orissa. The Congress, however, was as completely defeated in the five Muslim provinces, namely, Bengal, the Punjab, Sind, N.W. F. P. and Assam and even in the Hindu provinces failed to capture any appreciable number of seats in non-Hindu constituencies, particularly the Muslim electorates. This, undoubtedly, was an unsatisfactory situation for a self-styled 'national' party and the exposure of its communal character seemed imminent. Rushing to Wardha for guidance, the working committee took stock. What was the position? In five provinces they had been defeated and while they held a complete majority in six, the Oppositions, weak in numbers though they were, were led by the small but solid blocks of Muslim League members.

This situation had two very unsatisfactory aspects. First, it brought out the completely Hindu composition of the Congress and secondly, it would be difficult to ignore and over-ride Muslim oppositions as long as the Governors of provinces were in possession of special powers granted to safeguard the minority interest.

Realising at once that such circumstances would considerably hinder their plans, the Congress played its trump card. It refused to accept office. To the consternation of the Muslims and other minorities, overnight, the Viceroy and the Governors became suppliants. What would the Congress have them do? What assurances did the Congress need? The answer was ready. Give us the undertaking that you will not exercise your special powers and we will accept office. Hastily, the constitutional guardians of minority and other rights jettisoned their trust and amidst much mutual appreciation of each other's 'statesmanship' the Congress and the British Government came into political alliance. Victory number one. But there was still that troublesome first point. The whole game would be up if purely Hindu Governments took office and in at least three of the six provinces not a single Muslim had been returned on the Congress ticket and not more than one or two in the others. But what of it? Surely, there must be at least one amongst the Muslim members who would be unable to resist the bait of a ministership. They would offer the ministership provided he signed the Congress pledge. But would the Governor agree to this

"camouflage?" What did his Instrument of Instructions advise? 'In making appointments to his council of ministers our Governor shall use his best endeavour to select his ministers in the following manner, that is to say, in consultation with the person who in his judgment is likely to command a stable majority in the legislature, to appoint these persons (including so far as practicable members of important minority communities) who will best be in a position collectively to command the confidence of the legislature. But in so acting he shall bear constantly in mind the need of fostering a sense of responsibility among his ministers.'

Anxiously the working committee analysed the implications. The instructions seemed to be in two parts. In the first the Governor was instructed to use his best endeavours to select, as ministers,...persons (including as far as practicable members of important minority communities).....' The spirit underlying these words was clear. It was to secure important minorities a minister who commanded their confidence, and since there was no difference in the political programmes of the Congress and Muslim League parties in the legislatures, there was no reason why it was not 'practicable' for a Muslim League member to be appointed a minister.

But what about the last line? 'But in so acting he shall bear in mind the need for fostering sense of joint responsibility among his ministers.' This fortunately could be turned to suit their purpose if the Governor was prepared to allow this second part, advisory and subsidiary to the main instruction, to overrule the first. They had but to claim that joint responsibility was impossible unless the Muslim minister was prepared to abide by the decisions of the working committee and their point was won. Meekly the Governors acquiesced and in order to allow the Congress to deceive the public by making it appear that it was 'national' and looking after the interests of the minorities by including a 'representative' of them in the Council of Ministers, accepted as Muslim ministers individuals who by no stretch of imagination could be regarded as 'representatives' of the Muslim community and who, by signing the Congress pledge, were responsible to the working committee alone. Victory number two.

Surprised by such easy victories, the Congress became intoxicated with power. The working committee arrogated to itself the position of a parallel central Government to whom the provincial Governments were responsible. Regional dictators were appointed, and the Ministers were entirely subject to their orders generally, and no provincial legislation could be enacted without their approval. They then proceeded to stifle even the little opposition that existed. Having dealt with the British, they now dealt with the Muslims.

An India-wide attack on the Muslims was launched. In the five Muslim provinces every attempt was made to defeat the Muslim-led Coalition Ministries and by offering local political leaders ministerships and other inducements, Congress Ministries came into power in at least two more provinces, the N.-W. F. P. and Assam.

In the six Hindu provinces a *Kulturkampf* was inaugurated. Attempts were made to have *Bande Mataram*, the Congress party song, recognised as the national anthem; the party flag recognised as the national flag, and the real national language Urdu supplanted by Hindi. Everywhere oppression commenced and complaints poured in such force into the Muslim League's central office that the Pirpur Committee, whose report is available, was appointed to investigate these grievances. Such over-whelming evidence

was collected that the Muslims, despairing of the Viceroy and Governors ever taking action to protect them, have lately been forced to ask for a royal commission to investigate their grievances.

Such was the position on the eve of the resignation of the Congress Ministries, a position over which the British people might well ponder. Is it their desire that India should become a totalitarian Hindu State with the central and all the provincial Governments responsible not to their legislatures or to the electorate but to a caucus unknown to the Constitution, the working committee of the Congress. They may rest assured that such will be the inevitable result if the Congress demand for the right of framing India's constitution through a constituent assembly is conceded.

Let us consider briefly the implication of this nebulous and impracticable constituent assembly. To commence with, the question arises why is this demand made at this particular time. The answer is obvious. The war is to the working committee a heaven-sent means of increasing its rule from over eight provinces to over the whole of India, state and province. If the British Government are stampeded and fall into the trap under the stress of the critical situation created by the war, India will face a crisis the result of which no man could prophesy, and I feel certain that Muslim India will never submit to such a position and will be forced to resist it with every means in their power.

And of what type of constitutionalists will this constituent assembly consist? There are in India roughly four hundred million souls who, through no fault of their own, are hopelessly illiterate and consequently priest and caste-ridden. They have no real conception of how they are being governed even today and it is proposed that to the elected representatives of such, should India's future constitution be entrusted. Is it too much to say that since the vast majority of the elected representatives will be illiterate Hindus the constituent assembly will be under the influence of Mr. Gandhi and the Congress leaders and the constitution that will emerge will be as the working committee direct?

Thus, through the constituent assembly, will the working committee attain its ends. British control and commerce will disappear; the Indian States will be abolished; minority opposition will be stifled and a great Hindu nation will emerge governed by its beloved leader Mr. Gandhi and the Congress Working Committee.

We have now considered the disease and the symptoms. What is the remedy? (1) The British people must realise that unqualified Western democracy is totally unsuited for India and attempts to impose it must cease. (2) In India, it must be accepted that 'party' government is not suitable and all governments, central or provincial, must be governments that represent all sections of the people.

In this connection the All-India Muslim League has laid down the following broad principles:—

- (1) That the British Government should review and revise the entire problem of India's future constitution *de novo* in the light of the experience gained by the working of the present provincial constitution, and developments that have taken place since 1939 or which may take place hereafter.
- (2) While the Muslim League stands for a free India, it is irrevocably opposed to any federal objective which must necessarily result in

(3) No declaration regarding the question of constitutional advance for India should be made without the consent and approval of the All-India Muslim League, nor any constitution be framed and finally adopted by His Majesty's Government and the British Parliament without such consent and approval.

* * *

"We could attach no greater importance to it (the Communal Problem) than to make it the first condition for the attainment of our national goal. The Congress has always held this belief; no one can challenge this fact. It has always held to two basic principles in this connection, and every step was taken deliberately with these in view.

- * * *

(b) " " " " " " " " 296.

"We have considered the problem of the minorities of India. But are the Muslims such a minority as to have the least doubt or fear about their future? A small minority may legitimately have fears and apprehensions, but can the Muslims allow themselves to be disturbed by them? I do not know how many of you are familiar with my writings, twenty-eight years ago, in the "Al Hilal." If there are any such here, I would request them to refresh their memories. Even then I gave expression to my conviction, and I repeat this today, that in the texture of Indian politics, nothing is further removed from the truth than to say that Indian Muslims occupy the position of a political minority. It is equally absurd for them to be apprehensive about their rights and interests in a democratic India. This fundamental mistake has opened the door to countless misunderstandings. False arguments were built upon wrong premises. This error, on the one hand, brought confusion into the minds of Mussalmans about their own true position, and on the other hand, it involved the world in misunderstandings, so that the picture of India could not be seen in right perspective. (a)

*

*

*

"Politically speaking, the word minority does not mean just a group that is numerically smaller and therefore entitled to special protection. It means a group that is so small in number and so lacking in other qualities that give strength, that it has no confidence in its own capacity to protect itself from the much larger group that surrounds it. It is not enough that the group should be relatively the smaller, but that it should be absolutely so small as to be incapable of protecting its interests. Thus this is not merely a question of numbers; other factors count also. If a country has two major groups numbering a million and two millions respectively, it does not necessarily follow that because one is half the other, therefore, it must call itself politically a minority and consider itself weak.

If this is the right test, let us apply it to the position of the Muslims in India. You will see at a glance a vast concourse, spreading out all over the country; they stand erect, and to imagine that they exist helplessly as a "minority" is to delude oneself.

The Muslims in India number between eighty and ninety millions. The same type of social or racial divisions, which affect other communities, do not divide them. The powerful bonds of Islamic brotherhood and equality have protected them to a large extent from the weakness that flows from social divisions. It is true that they number only one-fourth of the total population; but the question is not one of population ratio, but of the large numbers and the strength behind them. Can such a vast mass of humanity have any legitimate reason for apprehension that in a free and democratic India, it might be unable to protect its rights and interests?

These numbers are not confined to any particular area but spread out unevenly over different parts of the country. In four provinces out of eleven in India there is a Muslim majority, the other religious groups being minorities. If British Baluchistan is added, there are five provinces with Muslim majorities. Even if we are compelled at present to consider this question on a basis of religious groupings, the position of the Muslims is not that of a minority only. If they are in a minority in seven provinces, they are in a majority in five. This being so, there is absolutely no reason why they should be oppressed by the feeling of being a minority. Whatever

may be the details of the future constitution of India, we know that it will be an all-India federation which is, in the fullest sense, democratic and every unit of which will have autonomy in regard to internal affairs. The federal centre will be concerned only with all-India matters of common concern, such as, foreign relations, defence, customs, etc. Under these circumstances, can any one who has any conception of the actual working of a democratic constitution, allow himself to be led astray by this false issue of majority and minority? I cannot believe for an instant that there can be any room whatever for these misgivings in the picture of India's future. These apprehensions are arising because in the words of a British statesman regarding Ireland we are yet standing on the banks of the river and, though wishing to swim, are unwilling to enter the water. There is only one remedy; we would take the plunge fearlessly. No sooner is this done, we shall realise that all our apprehensions were without foundation. (a)

*

*

*

Basic Question for Indian Muslims.—It is now nearly thirty years since I first attempted to examine this question as an Indian Mussalman. The majority of the Muslims then were keeping completely apart from the political struggle and they were influenced by the same mentality of aloofness and antagonism which prevailed amongst them previously in the year 1888. This depressing atmosphere did not prevent me from giving my anxious thought to this matter, and I reached quickly a final conclusion, which influenced my belief and action. I saw India, with all her many burdens, marching ahead to her future destiny. We were fellow-passengers in this boat and we could not ignore its swift passage through the waters; and so it became necessary for us to come to a clear and final decision about our plan of action. How were we to do so? Not merely by skimming the surface of the problem but by going down to its roots and then to consider our position. I did so and I realised that the solution of the whole problem depended on the answer to one question: Do we, Indian Muslims, view the free India of the future with suspicion and distrust or with courage and confidence? If we view it with fear and suspicion, then undoubtedly we have to follow a different path. No present declaration, no promise for the future, no constitutional safeguards, can be a remedy for our doubts and fears. We are then forced to tolerate the existence of a third power. This third power is already entrenched here and has no intention of withdrawing and, if we follow this path of fear we must needs look forward to its continuance. But if we are convinced that for us fear and doubt have no place, and that we must view the future with courage and confidence in ourselves, then our course of action becomes absolutely clear. We find ourselves in a new world, which is free from the dark shadows of doubt, vacillation in action, and apathy, and where the light of faith and determination, action and enthusiasm never fails. The confusions of the times, the ups and downs that come our way, the difficulties that beset our thorny path, cannot change the direction of our steps. It becomes our bounden duty then to march with assured steps to India's national goal.

I arrived at this definite conclusion without the least hesitation, and every fibre of my being revolted against the former alternative. I could not bear the thought of it. I could not conceive it possible for a Muslim to tolerate this, unless he has rooted out the spirit of Islam from every corner

of his being. I started the Al Hilal in 1912 and put this conclusion of mine before the Muslims of India.

* * *

“Towards the end of 1920—

I found that the political ideology of the Muslims had broken through its old mould and was taking another shape. Twenty years have gone by and much has happened since then. The tide of events has ever risen higher and fresh waves of thought have enveloped us. But this fact still remains unchanged, that the general opinion amongst the Muslims is opposed to going back.

That is certain; they are not prepared to retrace their steps. But again they are full of doubts about their future path. I am not going into the reasons for this. I shall only try to understand the effects. I would remind my co-religionists that today I have given thought to all those innumerable occurrences which have happened since then: my eyes have watched them, my mind has pondered over them. These events did not merely pass me by: I was in the midst of them, a participant, and I examined every circumstance with care. I cannot be false to what I have myself seen and observed; I cannot quarrel with my own convictions; I cannot stifle the voice of my conscience. I repeat today what I have said throughout this entire period that the ninety millions of Muslims of India have no other right course of action than the one to which I invited them in 1912.

Some of my-co-religionists, who paid heed to my call in 1912, are in disagreement with me today. I do not wish to find fault with them, but I would make appeal to their sincerity and sense of responsibility. We are dealing with the destinies of peoples and nations. We cannot come to right conclusions if we are swept away by the passions of the moment. We must base our judgments on the solid realities of life. It is true that the sky is overcast today and the outlook is dark. The Muslims have to come into the light of reality. Let them examine every aspect of the matter again today and they will find no other course of action open to them.

I am a Muslim and am proud of that fact. Islam's splendid traditions of thirteen hundred years are my inheritance. I am unwilling to lose even the smallest part of this inheritance. The teaching and history of Islam, its arts and letters and civilisation are my wealth and my fortune. It is my duty to protect them.

As a Muslim I have a special interest in Islamic religion and culture and I cannot tolerate any interference with them. But in addition to these sentiments I have others also which the realities and conditions of my life have forced upon me. The spirit of Islam does not come in the way of these sentiments, it guides and helps me forward. I am proud of being an Indian. I am a part of the indivisible unity that is Indian nationality. I am indispensable to this noble edifice and without me this splendid structure of India is incomplete. I am an essential element which has gone to build India. I can never surrender this claim.

It was India's historic destiny that many human races and cultures should flow to her, finding a home in her hospitable soil, and that many a caravan should find rest here. Even before the dawn of history, these caravans trekked into India and wave after wave of new-comers followed. This vast and fertile land gave welcome to all and took them to her bosom. One of the last of these caravans, following the foot-steps of its predecessors, was that of the followers of Islam. This came here and settled here for good.

This led to a meeting of the culture-currents of two different races. Like the Ganga and the Jumna, they flowed for a while through separate courses but nature's immutable law brought them together and joined them in a *sangam*. This fusion was a notable event in history. Since then, destiny, in her own hidden way, began to fashion a new India in place of the old. We brought our treasures with us and India too was full of the riches of her own precious heritage. We gave our wealth to her and she unlocked the doors of her own treasure to us. We gave her, what she needed most, the most precious gifts from Islam's treasury, the message of democracy and human equality.

Full eleven centuries have passed by since then. Islam has now as great a claim on the soil of India as Hinduism. If Hinduism has been the religion of the people here for several thousands of years, Islam also has been their religion for a thousand years. Just as a Hindu can say with pride that he is an Indian and follows Hinduism, so also we can say with equal pride that we are Indians and follow Islam. I shall enlarge this orbit still further. The Indian Christian is equally entitled to say with pride that he is an Indian and is following a religion of India, namely, Christianity.

Eleven hundred years of common history have enriched India with our common achievements. Our languages, our poetry, our literature, our culture, our art, our dress, our manners, and customs, the innumerable happenings of our daily life, everything bears the stamp of our joint endeavour. There is indeed no aspect of our life which has escaped this stamp. Our languages were different, but we grew to use a common language; our manners and customs were dissimilar, but they acted and reacted on each other and thus produced a new synthesis. Our old dress may be seen only in ancient pictures of by-gone days; no one wears it today. This joint wealth is the heritage of our common nationality and we do not want to leave it and go back to the times when this joint life had not begun. If there are any Hindus amongst us who desire to bring back the Hindu life of a thousand years ago and more, they dream, and such dreams are vain fantasies. So also if there are any Muslims who wish to revive their past civilisation and culture, which they brought a thousand years ago from Iran and Central Asia, they dream also and the sooner they wake up the better. These are unnatural fancies which cannot take root in the soil of reality. I am one of those who believe that revival may be a necessity in a religion but in social matters it is a denial of progress.

This thousand years of our joint life has moulded us into a common nationality. This cannot be done artificially. Nature does her fashioning through her hidden processes in the course of centuries. The cast has now been moulded and destiny has set her seal upon it. Whether we like it or not, we have now become an Indian nation, united and indivisible. No fantasy or artificial scheming to separate and divide can break this unity. We must accept the logic of fact and history and engage ourselves in the fashioning of our future destiny." (a)

Thus Spake Jinnah!

New Delhi, March 23rd, 1943.—Mr. M. A. Jinnah issued the following message to the Muslims of India on the Pakistan Day:—

"Today, March 23, is a day of great significance to Muslim India. On this auspicious day, three years ago, was declared, at Lahore, for the first

time authoritatively from the platform of the All-India Muslim League, the final Nataikval of Muslim India, which later on came to be known as the "Pakistan Scheme."

The progress that Mussalmans, as a nation, have made, during these three years, is a remarkable fact. Never before in the history of the world has a nation rallied round a common platform and a common ideal in such a short time as the Muslims have done in this vast sub-continent. Never before has a nation, miscalled a minority, asserted itself so quickly and so effectively. Never before has the mental outlook of a nation been unified so suddenly. Never before has the solidarity of millions of population been established and demonstrated in so limited a time and under such peculiar circumstances as are prevalent in India. Three years ago Pakistan was a resolution. Today it is an article of faith, a matter of life and death with Muslim India.

It is not mere sentiment or propaganda that has helped us in establishing our national solidarity. It is really the justice of our cause, the fairness of our demand and birthright to self-determination, by which, today, we are proud to stand and for which we are prepared to die.

We have embodied our goal in the famous Lahore resolution of the All-India Muslim League, as the only solution of the political problem of India. It is a proposal that will bring universal peace and will uphold and ensure the maintenance of honour and glory of the various sections of the peoples inhabiting this sub-continent.

We have created a solidarity of opinion, a union of mind and thought. Let us now concentrate on the uplift of our people for their educational, political, economic, social and normal (moral!) well-being. Let us co-operate with and give all help to our leaders to work for our collective good. Let us make our organisation stronger and stronger and put it on a thoroughly efficient footing. In all this the final sanction and censure rest with and upon the verdict of our people. We, the Muslims, must rely mainly upon our own inherent qualities, our own natural potentialities, our own internal solidarity and our own united will to face the future.

I particularly appeal to our intelligentsia and Muslim students to come forward and rise to the occasion. Train yourselves, equip yourselves and educate yourselves for the task that lies before us. The final victory depends upon you and is within our grasp. You have performed wonders in the past. You are still capable of repeating the history. You are not lacking in the great qualities and virtues in comparison with the other nations. Only you have to be fully conscious of that fact and to act with courage, faith and unity." (a)

CHAPTER II.

PAKISTAN DEFINED

“ Ideas, by the grace of God, are found on every bush.....The question is: which are the ideas applicable in regard to the existing circumstances of a people ?”

S. MEHEDINITZI. (a)

The Land of the Paks—

In the Encyclopaedia of Islam (Supplement No. 4, page 174; 1937) the following explanation is offered of the word PAKISTAN:—

“ PAKISTAN means the land of the Paks. The word Pak—pure, clear—is not adequately translatable into English, since it stands for all that is noble and sacred in life for a Muslim. The name Pakistan, which has come to be applied—though not officially—to the five Muslim Provinces in the North-West of the present-day India, is composed of letters taken from the names of her components, Punjab, Afghanis (North-West Frontier Province of which the inhabitants are mainly Afghans), Kashmir, Sindh, and Baluchi-stan, and was given to these territories by C. Rahmat Ali, founder of the Pakistan National Movement, in 1933, with a view to preserving their historical, national and political entity as distinct from Hindustan proper.....” (b)

Two Federations—Muslim & non-Muslim

The Sind Provincial Muslim League at its sessions in October, 1938 adopted the following Resolution :—

“ ‘ This Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference consider it absolutely essential in the interests of an abiding peace of the vast Indian continent and in the interests of unhampered cultural development, the economic and social betterment and political self-determinations of the two nations, known as Hindus and Muslims, that India may be divided into two Federations, viz.,— Federation of Muslim States and the Federation of non-Muslim States.

This Conference therefore recommends to the All-India Muslim League to devise a scheme of constitution under which Muslim majority provinces, Muslim Native States and areas inhabited by a majority of Muslims may attain full independence in the form of a Federation of their own with permission to any other Muslim State beyond the Indian Frontiers to join the Federation, and with such safeguards for non-Muslim minorities as may be conceded to the Muslim minorities in the non-Muslim Federation of India.’

- (a) “ GREAT ESSAYS OF ALL NATIONS ” — by F. H. Pritchard, page 803.
 (b) “ THE COMMUNAL TRIANGLE IN INDIA ” — by Mehta and Patwardhan.
 Appendix III.

It is possible to score debating points out of this resolution. But these would not help us to understand and explain the working of the mind that after seven or eight centuries of Indian domicile can and does assert that it is unrelated to the moral and spiritual life that is India's, that owing to doctrinal kinship feels itself nearer to Afghanistan, for instance, than to India, that seeks and finds a nearer neighbour in the Afghan than in the Hindu. We have to find out why the Muslim mind in India feels itself unable and finds itself unable to live in moral and spiritual neighbourliness with its Hindu neighbour; we have to find out what have been the impersonal influences that after centuries of some sort of a reconciliation worked out in India drive the Muslims to declare that they are a separate nation here. We have to find out among the many traditions obtaining amongst Muslims those that have stood in the way of their evolving a common life with peoples of differing creeds living in the same country. . . .

The difficulty of Indian Muslims is due to the fact that they cannot accept India as Dar-ul-Islam, door or country of Islam, because the rulers at present are non-Muslims; and even in the future, in the 'democratic swaraj' of Indian dreams and strivings, the authority of the State will be exercised by representatives of the people, the majority of them Hindus. Indian Muslims feel that the country is not and cannot be Dar-ul-Aman, door or country of peace to Islam, as there is likelihood of their religious and cultural traditions being subjected to interference or non-Muslim control. Therefore, India has been and is a Dar-ul-Harab, the door or country of enmity to Islam. . . . In 1864 the posts of Hindu law-givers and Muslim kazis were abolished and, according to Qazi Muhammad Ahmed Kazmi, 'it was at that time that the Mussalmans began to think and consider whether India was Dar-ul-Harab, or Dar-ul-Aman, or Dar-ul-Islam. . . . It was at that time that continuous agitation was carried on by Mussalmans and they decided that India was not Dar-ul-Islam, it ceased to be Dar-ul-Aman, and it was Dar-ul-Harab. Even uptil today certain of Muslim prayers are offered on the basis that it was Dar-ul-Harab.'

Here we think we get an inside view of the mind of the Muslims in India who under the influence of old-world ideas are being taught every day of their life in their mosques that India was a country of enmity. We have been told of a sect among the Muslims of Bengal, about 30 lakhs strong, to whom congregational prayers are prohibited owing to an injunction of the Quran: Because, in enemy countries the life of the faithful assembled in a congregation for prayers was likely to be exposed to attacks, leading to mass massacre. This daily repetition of India being an enemy country, the offering of daily prayers based on the thought or belief that India was Dar-ul-Harab, this practice creates and starts those mental processes that make the Muslims in India so impatient, that make possible the outburst of violence of thought and action at the slightest of occasions. Indian history of recent years is full of instances of this impatience." (a)

*

*

*

Bengalee Nationalism

" 'To Muslim Islam as a religion is the centre of community life; Muslims living in different countries are brothers in faith. These are self-evident truths. But as ideals in State-life, the Khilafat and Pan-Islamism are out of date as symbols of State organisation today:

In these ideals we do not find and feel the stirring of life. In the independent Muslim countries the ideals of community life that Nationalism

stands for have been accepted today. If we hug to our bosom an ideal that was valid in the past but is almost lifeless today we will fail in our literary life, in our State life.'

This is the cruel test that the Muslim community in India must pass through, said Mr Wazed Ali (Bar-at-Law, Presidency Magistrate, Calcutta). Further analysing the cruelty of the choice he said that it is not possible, it is difficult, for Muslims in India to accept and to work for the idea and ideal of an all-India Nationalism—the idea and ideal of an India, one, whole, and indivisible. That would mean for Indian Muslims the acceptance of the superiority of the majority community in India, of the Hindus. But, under present circumstances, no Muslim in India can heartily accept such an idea and ideal, heartily welcome the possibility of their success. At the same time they cannot contemplate the present state of political dependence as a permanent arrangement. What was the way out? As a Bengalee Muslim, speaking to a Bengalee Muslim audience, Mr. Wazed Ali presented to them the ideal of developing the particularism, the uniqueness of life in Bengal, distinct and peculiar. As an ideal of State organisation the people of Bengal will not separate themselves from India or any federation in India. But

'Our aim will be not an All-India Nationalism but a Bengalee Nationalism equal with others in a free federation of States in India just as within the British Commonwealth of Nations there are enthroned the Canadian, Australian and the Irish Nationalisms.... For us (Bengalee Muslims) this ideal is the way, the only way, to our ultimate good. With this ideal there is no possibility of conflict in our communal interests, in our religious and cultural interests. The same can be said of Bengalee Hindus who are almost equal in number to Bengalee Muslims. In number the Muslims are a majority, a small majority, but in prestige and influence the Hindus are dominant. Therefore both the communities can heartily accept this ideal and devote their energies to the service of their common motherland.'

We have noticed Mr. Wazed Ali's speech in some detail because we think that it represents the movement of thought in a section of the educated Muslim community; because it represents an attempt to build up a bridge of reconciliation between two schools of thought in India that appear to be divided on strictly communal lines. He appears to suggest that the concept of patriotism and nationalism accepted today in the world, in India, is easy for the Hindu to understand and accept, because he belongs to the majority community in this country, and as far as human imagination could look forward to, the Hindu will remain so. The Indian Muslim cannot accept and work for this idea; it is not in human nature to do so. Therefore he suggested as the ideal for the Bengalee Muslim what may be called Linguistic Nationalism, a new cement of human relations, the tie and the bond of language that bind the Bengalee Hindu and the Bengalee Muslim. He did not appear to have any interest in the All-India Nationalism that claims the allegiance of the majority of the modern-educated men and women of India. Because he did not believe and he gave expression to this scepticism in the speech under review that India was ever one and whole, politically and administratively. Even during the hey-day of Muslim rule in India, either during the period when Pathan or Moghul Emperors ruled at Delhi, there was no central administration in the country that could claim the allegiance of the whole country, or which was accepted by the many kingdoms and principalities

in the country. The less than two hundred years of centralised rule imposed by British administrators over India has not been able to create that one-ness of spirit that is the motive power of nationalism. But Mr. Wazed Ali's ideal has its difficulties in the way as the history of the last two and half years has indicated so pointedly. The integrity of the language which we know today as Bengalee is not accepted by a powerful section of the educated Muslims; they resent the Hindu ideas and imageries that are abundant in that language today, and it is no longer possible to ignore the fact that an organised attempt is being made by them to de-Hinduise, or to put it in another way, to Islamise, the language of Bengal. Here is a conflict which Mr. Wazed Ali did not make any attempt to reconcile. In every province and area the Hindu and the Muslim have been wrangling over this question of language, of script, endangering the ideal which has been placed before the country as a solvent of the conflicts and competitions that divide India today. Except in Bengal, in the Punjab, in the North-West Frontier Province, in Sind, where the Muslims are the majority population and are sure of their position, the Muslims will be the first to refuse to accept this ideal of Linguistic Nationalism." (a)

*

*

*

Seven Schemes of Pakistan

"The 'Islamic Culture' of Hyderabad (Deccan), a Quarterly Journal published under the auspices of the thought-leaders of the Nizam State headed by the late Sir Akbar Hydari, in its 'Cultural Activities, Section in a recent issue speaks of Seven Schemes outlined by Muslim thinkers and public men. These are:—

Sir Sikandar Hayat's Scheme

The Pakistan Plan

The Quinque-partite Scheme of the Nawab of Mamdot

The Pakistan Caliphate

Dr. Latif's Cultural Future of India

The Scheme of Muslim Federation

The Eastern Afghanistan Scheme

Independent Afghan State

Peshawar, April 25, 1943:—The Afghans should exert their utmost for their separate national existence and try to establish their own independent state in order to save themselves from the destructive flames of war which have ruined so many nations, declared Mulla Mazar Sharif in his presidential address at the Afghan National Council.

He said whether the Afghans were Aryans or Semetic, the supreme fact was that they were Muslims, and as such independence was their birthright. He expressed gratitude to the Almighty God that the Muslim countries like Turkey and Afghanistan were safe and free from the destructive effects of war, because they were united and organised, and advised Afghans to organise themselves.

The Conference adopted a resolution appealing to the Afghan nationals living between the borders of Russia, China, Iran and India to

unite and try for their rights of self-determination under one man following the Quranic law in the strict sense.

By another resolution the Conference urged on the Government to introduce Pushtu as the medium of instruction in schools in the interest of the nation's progress.

The Conference also decided to request the Government to establish Qazi's Courts to try cases of Muslims according to the Shariat Act—A. P.(a)

The first Scheme was published in the Indian Press on the 30th of July, 1939, and it must await discussion and criticism in the next volume of the Annual Register. The others or certain of them we quote below from a summary published in the pages of the 'Islamic Culture' as 'Cultural Activities':—

Pakistan Caliphate

The Punjab Muslim Students dream of a Pakistan Caliphate in the North, Moulana Abdul Wadood of the Jamiat Ulema, Sarhand, envisages an independent Muslim State to be called Eastern Afghanistan. The proposed Pakistan Caliphate is to comprise not only Sind, Baluchistan, the North-West Frontier Province, Kashmir and the Punjab, as included in the original Pakistan Scheme, but also embraces in its fold parts of the United Provinces, and the Central Provinces and Berar running along with the Ganges right up to Bengal and Assam. Both the Schemes aim at establishing an exclusively Muslim State in Northern India. The rest of India is described as 'God's Country.' The Muslim Students' Federation which has propounded the Scheme of Pakistan Caliphate claims the birthright of Muslims in North India as their home lands, and in other words, means exclusive rights of Muslims where they predominate. The proposed Muslim State, according to its authors, will be ruled by a spiritual dictator who will be the shadow of God on earth.....in accordance with the injunctions of the Holy Quran. The Scheme has already found support among the tribes—Mohmands, Afridis, Waziris, and various tribal areas'. (b) "

* * * * *

League's Pakistan Resolution of 1940

"Text of Resolution No. 1 on future constitution of India passed at the 27th Annual Sessions of the All-India Muslim League held at Lahore on the 22nd, 23rd and 24th March, 1940:—

(1) While approving and endorsing the action taken by the Council and the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, as indicated in their resolutions dated the 27th of August, 17th and 18th of September and 22nd of October, 1939, and 3rd of February, 1940, on the constitutional issue, this Session of the All-India Muslim League emphatically reiterates that the scheme of federation embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, is totally unsuited to, and unworkable in the peculiar conditions of this country and is altogether unacceptable to Muslim India.

(2) It further records its emphatic view that while the declaration dated the 18th of October, 1939 made by the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty's Government is reassuring in so far as it declares that the policy and plan on which the Government of India Act, 1935, is

(a) Vide The Daily Gazette, Karachi, dated the 27th April, 1943.

(b) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1939, Vol. 1, pages 65-66

based, will be reconsidered in consultation with the various parties, interests and communities in India, Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the whole constitutional plan is reconsidered *de novo* and that no revised plan will be acceptable to the Muslims unless it is framed with their approval and consent.

- (3) Resolved that it is the considered view of this Session of the All-India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principle, *viz.*, that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India should be grouped to constitute 'Independent States' in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign.

That adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in these regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them; and in other parts of India where the Mussalmans are in a minority, adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specially provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them.

This Session further authorises the Working Committee to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles, providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, communications, customs and such other matters as may be necessary." (a)

* * *

Extract from the Proceedings of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, Bombay, 31st August—2nd September, 1940:—

"The Working Committee place on record that some of the observations made in the statement of His Excellency the Viceroy and also in the speech of the Secretary of State for India, with regard to the theory of unity of national life which does not exist, are historically inaccurate and self-contradictory. Such observations are calculated to raise apprehensions in the minds of the Mussalmans of India, and therefore, the Committee deem it necessary to reaffirm and make the position clear once more that the Committee stand by the Lahore resolution and the basic principles underlying the terms thereof proposing the division of India and the creation of independent states in the north-western and eastern zones of India where the Muslims are in a majority, and the Committee declare their determination, firm resolve and faith that the partition of India is the only solution of the most difficult and complex problem of India's future constitution, and are glad to see that the vital importance and the true aspect of this question are being fully realised by the British Parliament: and that His Majesty's Government are now fully apprised and seized of the realities of the situation.

The Muslim League again makes its position clear that the Muslims of India are a nation by themselves and will exercise their right to self-determination and that they alone are the final judges and arbiters of their own future destiny." (a)

The terms "DARU'L-HARB" and "DARU'L-ISLAM," in the extract given in this chapter under the head 'Two Federations—Muslim and Non-Muslim,' are explained as under at pages 69-70 of "A DICTIONARY OF ISLAM" by the Revd. Thomas Patrick Hughes, B. D., M. R. A. S.

Daru'l-Harb

"The land of warfare."

According to the Dictionary 'Ghiyasul-Lughat, Daru'l-Harb is 'a country belonging to infidels which has not been subdued by Islam.' According to the Qamus, it is 'a country in which peace has not been proclaimed between Muslims and unbelievers.'

In the Fatawa 'Alamgiri, vol. ii, p. 854, it is written that a Daru'l-Harb becomes a DARU'L-ISLAM on one condition, namely, the promulgation of the edicts of Islam. The Imam Muhammad, in his book called the Ziyadah, says a Daru'l-Islam again becomes a Daru'l-Harb, according to Abu Hanifah, on three conditions, namely: (1) That the edicts of the unbelievers be promulgated, and the edicts of Islam be suppressed; (2) that the country in question be adjoining a Daru'l-Harb and no other Muslim country lie between them (that is, when the duty of Jihad or religious war becomes incumbent on them, and they have not the power to carry it on); (3) That no protection (aman) remains for either a Muslim or a zimmi; viz., that amanul-awwal, or that first protection which was given them when the country was first conquered by Islam. The Imams Yusuf and Muhammad both say that when the edicts of unbelievers are promulgated in a country, it is sufficient to constitute it a Daru'l-Harb.

In the Raddul-Mukhtar, vol. iii, p. 391, it is stated, "if the edicts of Islam remain in force, together with the edicts of the unbelievers, then the country cannot be said to be a Daru'l-Harb." The important question as to whether a country in the position of Hindustan may be considered a Daru'l-Islam or a Daru'l-Harb has been fully discussed by Dr. W. W. Hunter, of the Bengal Civil Service, in his work entitled 'Indian Mussulmans,' which is the result of careful inquiry as to the necessary conditions of a Jihad, or a Crescentade, instituted at the time of the excitement which existed in India in 1870-71, in consequence of a Wahhabi conspiracy for the overthrow of Christian rule in that country. The whole matter, according to Sunni Musulmans, hinges upon the question whether India is Daru'l-Harb, 'a land of warfare,' or Daru'l-Islam, 'a land of Islam.'

The Muftis belonging to the Hanifi and Shafi'i sects at Makkah decided that, "as long as even some of the peculiar observances of Islam prevail in a country, it is Daru'l-Islam." (b)

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1940, Vol. II, page 243.

(b) In pursuance of the solemn declaration in Queen Victoria's Proclamation of 1858, it must be said to the credit of the British Administration that it has scrupulously refrained from interference with the religious observances of all the several communities in India with the result that all the peculiar observances of Islam continue to prevail in this country in their entirety without any infringement whatever as they might do in any Muslim country, e.g., the observance of the Muharrum, the offering of Sacrifice, etc.

The decision of the Mufti of the Maliki sect was very similar, being to the following effect: "a country does not become a Daru'l-Harb as soon as it passes into the hands of the infidels, but when all or most of the injunctions of Islam disappear therefrom." (a)

The law doctors of North India decided that, "the absence of protection and liberty to Mussulmans is essential in a Jihad, or religious war, and also that there should be a probability of victory to the armies of Islam."

The Shiah decision on the subject was as follows:—"A Jihad is lawful only when the armies of Islam are led by the rightful Imam when arms and ammunitions of war and experienced warriors are ready, when it is against the enemies of God, when he who makes war is in possession of his reason, and when he has secured the permission of his parents, and has sufficient money to meet the expenses of the journey."

The Sunnis and Shiahs alike believe in the eventual triumph of Islam, when the whole world shall become followers of the Prophet of Arabia; but, whilst the Sunnis are, of course, ready to undertake the accomplishment of this great end, "whenever there is a probability of victory to the Mussulmans," the Shiahs, true to the one great principle of their sect, must wait until the appearance of the rightful Imam.

Daru'l-Islam—"Land of Islam"

According to the Raddu'l-Mukhtar, Vol. iii, p. 391, it is a country in which the edicts of Islam are fully promulgated.

In a state brought under Muslims, all those who do not embrace the faith are placed under certain disabilities. They can worship God according to their own customs, 'provided they are not idolaters'; but it must be done without any ostentation, and, whilst churches and synagogues may be repaired, 'no new place of worship can be erected.' "The construction of churches, or synagogues, in Muslim territory is unlawful, this being forbidden in the Traditions; but if places of worship belonging to Jews, or Christians, be destroyed, or fall into decay, they are at liberty to repair them, because buildings cannot endure for ever."

Idol temples must be destroyed, and idolatry suppressed by force in all countries ruled according to strict Muslim law. (Hidayah, vol. ii, p. 219).

Daru'l-Harb & Daru'l-Islam

"In the controversies among different sectaries of Islam, precipitated by the Wahhabis, there is one theory in which both the government and the other communities are vitally interested—the theory which divided the world into 'Daru'l-Islam', the 'country of safety' comprising all Moslem Kingdoms, and 'Dar-ul-Harb', the 'country of enmity' including all non-believing nations. According to the doctrines of the Hanafi sect, three conditions condemn a country to be regarded as a 'Dar-ul-Harb';

- (i) The public exercise of infidel authority, and the non-exercise of Moslem authority within it;

(a) Far from 'all or most of the injunctions of Islam disappearing from the country,' the actual position is that barring the Mahomedan Criminal Law and the Mahomedan Law of Evidence, important matters such as Succession, Inheritance, Wills, Gifts, Wakfs, Pre-Emption, Marriage, Dower, Maintenance, Divorce, Parentage, Guardianship, etc., are all governed by the Mahomedan Law.

- (ii) Annexation to the 'Dar-ul-Harb' without the interposition of any Moslem city or community;
- (iii) The non-existence in it of a true believer.

The second and the third conditions do not apply to India, for it touches countries under Moslem domination, and the Moslem population of India count one-fifth of the total population. The first condition condemns India to a 'country of enmity' if it be rigidly interpreted; for the ruling authority in India is in 'infidel' hands, non-Moslem. There is a lack of unanimity among Moslem jurists in their attitude to India. And the prospect of a democratic responsible self-government based on majority vote or voice cannot be welcome to the upholders of this theory, for, so far as human calculations go, the ruling authority will still be non-Muslim. Here is the source and root of the apparently insoluble problems of majority and minority representation, separate electorates, Moslem provinces, reservation and weightage. India does not satisfy conditions of orthodox statehood beloved of Hanafi doctrinaires. It is true that a section of Moslem jurists were or are prepared to waive objections to India being considered as 'Dar-ul-Islam' considering the immense size of the Moslem population of the country. But the Hanafi theorists, under the influence of Wahhabism, as preached by Mohammad Ismail, one of the first and foremost disciples of Sayyad Ahmmad, held that India cannot be regarded as 'Dar-ul-Islam' as and when it is under 'infidel authority.' They called the testimony of Jewish history to the support of the condition of Indian Moslems under the British comparing it to that 'of the Israelites in Egypt,' hoping and praying for a second Moses who would lead them out of servitude and destitution to freedom and plenitude. Under the influence of this belief the followers of Sayyad Ahmmad levied war against the British Government in India. That the general body of the Moslem intelligentsia do not hold or stand by the strict interpretation of the Hanafi-cum-Wahhabi theory of state is all too apparent. But while conscious reason rejects as absurd many a theory or doctrine, the unconscious soul of nations or societies hugs them to heart. Therefore it is that Indian Moslems are torn by divided loyalties, one to their country and the other to their creed. This conflict stands in the way of their thought-leaders giving a right lead to their community; it has clouded their counsels and encouraged them to cultivate a conceit of a separate and inviolate entity. How far this could go was expressed by Maulavi Kootbud-din, a successor of Shah Abdul Aziz, in his book "Tama Tafasar" published at Delhi in 1867. The following quotation is pertinent to the point under discussion:—

"The prophet said, 'I am displeased with every one of those Mussalmans who live among *Mushriks* (a term applied to Christians in India).' The companions of the Prophet asked him. 'O Messenger of God, why are you displeased?' Then the Prophet replied, 'Because it is essential to faith, that *Mushriks* and *Mussalmans* should not be able to see each others' fires, i. e., it is necessary for a Muhammedan to keep himself at such a distance and so far aloof from a *Kafir*, that they may not be able to see each others' fire. Living amongst them is out of the question, for it produces weakness in Islam. This weakness is caused by looking at their custom."

...The 'Dar-ul-Harb' theory and its logical corollary, the imperative duty of a 'jihad' imposed on the faithful and pious Moslem, intruded themselves into public view with all their menace to the peace and prosperity of a country inhabited by a composite population. Leaders of Moslem opinion hastened forward to repudiate the logic of the Wahhabi interpretation of Moslem jurisprudence. Maulavi Keramat Ali of Jaunpur, one time Wahhabi missionary and one of the most celebrated Moslem religious teachers of the day, proved that British India was 'Dar-ul-Islam,' and that as such it was 'unlawful and

irreligious' for Indian Moslems to preach a 'jehad' against the British Government established in the country..... The repudiation of the 'Dar-ul-Harb' theory in its application to India through the pen and voice of Maulavi Keramat Ali of Jaunpur was the ultimate stage of the process, of penance, the deliverance of the Moslem mind in India from the thralldom of an exclusive religious bigotry out of tune with mid-19th century rationalism, and fraught with danger to a country where men of different faiths must learn to live peacefully as neighbours, where 'each other's fire' cannot but be visible to each other, and where they must pull their full weight if the country were to evolve into an equal among equals in the comity of nations. This is an aspiration unrealised yet..."

(Extracts from The Indian Annual Register, 1936 Vol. I pages 58-60).

CHAPTER III

PAKISTAN—VIEWS FOR AND AGAINST.

A considerable volume of literature has come into existence on the subject of PAKISTAN. The most important of all is the publication issued by Mr. Jinnah in October, 1940 entitled "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION," which, as stated on its title page, is a collection of essays by various authors providing material for "an unbiased, scientific and analytical study" of the subject. It gives one an insight into the working of the Muslim mind vis-a-vis the question of India's future constitution—at least the mind of those Muslims whom the League claims to represent—and while one may hold one's own views on the subject, it must be conceded that the collection forms an admirable presentation of the case for PAKISTAN.

The arguments supporting the case for PAKISTAN have found an echo among the Dravidians of South India, and Mr. Jinnah's Book contains articles advancing the demand for the constitution of one or more DRAVIDASTANS in the South.

While several learned books have been written supporting the case for PAKISTAN, equally learned ones have also been written claiming that PAKISTAN would not only be undesirable for the Muslims themselves, but would be a calamity for India as a whole. To a person interested in the subject there is thus available a great volume of literature presenting all the arguments and counter-arguments that could be advanced both for and against the principle and scheme or schemes of PAKISTAN. The present chapter gives a few of these views which, it is hoped, will give the average reader, the Man in the Street, a fair idea of the Issue and its pros and cons.

PROS

No basis for Hindu-Muslim unity: Cultural Differences

"Now we will proceed to explain the various arguments that are advanced in support of separation by its advocates as well as the criticism offered against it by its opponents.

We, the separationists, allege that the Hindus and Muslims are not a single nation and that the fiction of a composite nation was created with ulterior motives by the interested parties to keep in check the separatist tendencies of the Indian Muslims, which they, in the beginning, showed by a general, vague, undefined feeling of being fed up with India, disowning it as their country and always preferring in their praises other Muslim countries to it, more especially the country of the Holy Prophet, Arabia. We say that this was done to disassociate the Indian Muslims from the rest of the Muslim world on account of pan-Islamic apprehensions. On account of the differences of culture, religion, language, past traditions, economic interests and past political rivalries between the two major nationalities, they cannot be included in a homogeneous whole even by centuries' sincere efforts at suppressing the causes which have kept them apart during their common past in India.

Those who do not look with favour on the idea of separation and whom we had better describe as anti-separationists, do not admit the existence of any such differences between the two nationalities as may be irremovable. They deny altogether the differences pertaining to culture, language and past traditions. As regards the religious differences they do admit that religiously Hindus and Muslims are not one and propose that religion should be kept apart from politics as is the case in the Western countries. We do not admit the feasibility of all this for to deny the existence of any differences between the cultures of the Hindus and Muslims amounts to a failure to distinguish one colour from another. The violet colour may be the mixture of red and blue and, in it, the tinge of each of these two colours may also be present but it cannot be identified with any one of them. Similarly the Muslim culture in India may be a cross-fertilization of the Semitic and Aryan ideas and it may represent the refinement of its Aryan mother along with the sterling character of its Semetic father but all the same it remains Muslim—neither Semitic nor Aryan. It is quite vividly distinguishable from both the parents. According to us culture does not only mean music or a few other uniformities of taste that the Hindus and Muslims may have mutually acquired from one another's company. Speaking English, dressing in the Western style, eating at a dinner table, now and then listening to and enjoying English music whether on the radio or in talkies do not make us culturally one with the Europeans. Similarly, if there are any uniformities of taste between the Hindus and Muslims, it does not mean that they have made them a single nation. So far as the racial aspect of the question is concerned, Islam does not believe in the conception of nationalism as based on territorial patriotism. The conception of Islamic 'Millat' is universal in its character and is based on the uniformity of religious belief alone.

The linguistic differences, although they mostly relate to script, are of very great importance. In our view the linguistic controversy between the Hindus and Muslims again pertains to cultural differences. The cultural associations of a people are sometimes also bound up with a particular script and the danger is always there of their being destroyed by desuetude.

To us civilisation indicates a set of principles and moral values upon which it is based. The Hindu society is based on the caste-system which in itself is a negation of democracy and nationalism; on tenderness to life (due to the influence of Buddhism on Hinduism); on pure spiritualism; on atonement of materialism by charity; and on a mental state of suspicion resulting from misinterpretation of their holy scriptures, which often shows itself in the individual either in the form of a desire for longevity or fear complex deeply settled in his sub-conscious mind. As compared with the Hindu civilisation, the Islamic civilisation is based on broad principles of humanity, moral justice, and a mental state of fearlessness of all that is non-God, resulting from a firm belief in the unity and omnipotency of the Godhead. We further believe that as the formation of the mind depends upon civilisation, which can have varying underlying principles, there can be various types of mind whether of individuals or societies. The manifestation of mind in various forms of conduct or rational human activity is expressive of culture. And as the mind of the Hindu society differs from that of the Muslim, it expresses itself differently from that of the latter's mind. The feelings and impulses which may arise in a Hindu mind at the sight of a pipal tree, a tulsi bush, a cow, a crow or an insect, may be quite different from those which may arise in a Muslim mind. While a Muslim mind may take only a utilitarian view of all these forms of life, in a Hindu

mind they may create absolutely different impulses, impulses of adoration, fear and doubt, all ultimately based on the dynastic influences which tended to form that mind in the ages past." (a)

Opposed Economic Interests

"After explaining these controversies relating to cultural and other differences of the nationalities, I come to the economic side of the question. Here again the anti-separationists allege that the economic interests of the whole of India are common. We do not agree with them and refer them to the pages of 'The Wealth and Welfare of the Punjab' by Mr. Calvert and 'Confederacy of India' by the present author. In brief, Mr. Calvert's argument is that the Muslim North-West as also the rest of Northern India is mostly agricultural while Southern India is industrial. As everywhere in the world, the industrial interests are always more influential. They can bribe and influence the legislature and the government into passing measures and adopting policies beneficial for themselves. A government under the influence of rich capitalists may adopt a policy of raising high tariff walls against foreign imports to protect home industry and to afford to the industrialists a fair and easily accessible market for the consumption of their finished goods. If this happened in the case of India, as it is likely to happen, the agricultural Northern India will feel that the Southern Industrial India is being pampered at its cost. Protection may mean a fair market for the industrialists within India, but to the agricultural interests it means a restricted market for the sale of their raw material. In the same book Mr. Calvert has referred to the cases of Australia and the U.S.A., where similar conditions arose to the detriment of the agricultural interests. Under such conditions the agricultural interests have always to pay more for the imports while they get less for their exports.

The anti-separationists in reply to this say that if this is true, then why not effect separation between the whole of the agricultural Northern India on the one hand and the industrial Southern India on the other. Our reply to this is quite simple. We do not want to continue any longer the complications which have so far been an unfortunate feature of Muslim politics. If our economic interests, mainly agricultural, are common with the rest of Northern India, we are divided from it by our cultural interests. In a separated agricultural Northern India the cultural clash between the two nationalities will continue. Therefore we, once for all, want to cut through this Gordian knot of Indian politics." (b)

Financially The Scheme Is Sound

"Lastly we come to the objection that has been raised against separation on the ground of insufficient finances. The following statements, which show some figures relating to various sources of central revenues, will help to form an idea of the true position of the Sind Regions from the point of view of central finance. These figures are taken from the 'Statistical Abstract for British India' prepared by the Department of Commercial Intelligence and Statistics, India. This abstract gives figures only of years upto 1935-36. Hence the figures shown in the following statements relate to the year 1935-36.

-
- (a) "SEPARATION—A reply to its Critics" by "A Punjabi," pages 6-10.
 - (b) "SEPARATION—A Reply to its Critics" by "A Punjabi," pages 10-12.

Income-Tax**Receipts**

	Rs.
Baluchistan ...	2,09,917
N.-W. F. P. ...	10,56,136
Punjab ...	87,80,481
Sind ...	11,00,000
Total...	1,11,46,534

Total Receipts of
Government of India, ... 15,77,08,274

Post Offices

The total amount of money orders
issued during 1935-36:—

Postal Circle	
Punjab and N.-W.F.P. ...	9,78,73,720
Sind and Baluchistan ...	2,21,44,488
Total...	12,00,18,208
1/6th that of India	
Total for India ...	71,72,59,466

Total Shipping of Ports

Bombay Tons ...	1,35,17,000
Rangoon „ ...	85,49,000
Calcutta „ ...	81,53,000
Karachi „ ...	51,56,000

Fourth among ports.

Salt

Punjab Mines Mds. ...	41,11,662
Kohat Quarries „ ...	5,47,081
Mandi „ ...	1,15,049
Sambhar Lake „ ...	73,21,083
Salt Range „ ...	62,962

(prevention circles)

Total...	1,21,57,837
Sind ...	29,46,554
Total...	1,50,83,641

1/3rd of India
Indian Total „ ... 4,10,49,664

**Total Sea-Borne Trade, Foreign
and Coasting in Private
Merchandise**

	Rs.
Bombay ...	12,91,00,000
Calcutta ...	12,22,30,000
Rangoon ...	6,77,70,000
Karachi ...	4,99,80,000

Fourth among ports

**Movement of Certain Articles
by Rail and River Between the
Different Trade Blocks
in India****(1) Cotton piece-goods imports—**

Punjab Mds.	19,65,000
Sind and British	
Baluchistan „	5,01,000
Kashmir „	40,000
Total	25,09,000
One-fourth of India	
Total for India	1,01,32,000

(2) Iron Imports:—

Punjab Mds.	50,57,000
Sind Br. Bal. „	14,19,000
Kashmir „	52,000
Total	65,28,000
One-seventh of India	
Total for India	4,05,04,000

(3) Sugar Imports:—

Punjab Mds.	54,06,000
Sind and Br. Bal. „	9,83,000
Kashmir „	60,000
Total	64,49,000
One-half of India	
Total for India	1,20,31,000

(4) Coal and Coke imports:—

Punjab Mds.	4,88,56,000
Sind and Br. Bal. „	68,33,000
Kashmir „	1,62,000
Total	5,58,51,000
2/13th of India	
Total for India	38,67,92,000

N.-W. Railway**Commercial and Military**

Gross Earnings	Working Expenses	Net Earnings
Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
16,45,96,000	12,02,32,000	4,43,64,000

The foregoing statements demonstrate that the total amount of income-tax collected from the provincial units in the Sind Regions by the Government of India in 1935-36 was Rs. 1,11,46,534; the position of the postal circles of these areas judging from the amount of money orders issued during the same year was about 1/6th; from the point of view of total shipping of ports the position of the Karachi port was the fourth among the eight principal ports of India; judging from the volume of sea-borne trade the position of Karachi port was again fourth among the ports of India; in view of the movement of certain principal articles by Rail and River between the various trade blocks in India the position of the Sind Regions as regards cotton piece-goods was fourth, as regards iron imports seventh, as regards sugar imports second, and as regards coal and coke imports sixth; so far as manufactured salt is concerned, it produced 1/3rd of the quantity produced by the whole of India; and as regards net earnings from the N. W. Railway they were Rs. 4,43,64,000. Our position as depicted by these figures is not as pessimistic as is often alleged by the opponents of the movement.

Now let us proceed to estimate the revenues of the Sind Regions as based on the Government of India receipts for the year 1935-36. The following table shows the receipts from the various sources of income which can be tapped in case of separation of our regions from the rest of India. It will also be seen that we have based the estimates of receipts from different heads of revenue on a minimum of expectation, in some cases even putting them at 1/20th part of the revenue receipts of the Government of India from a particular source.

Estimated Revenue of Pakistan as based on the Government of India Receipts for 1935-36

			Rs.	
Customs	13,50,00,000	1/4th of Central Receipts
Income-Tax (Actual Central Receipts)	1,11,46,534	
Salt	2,80,93,469	1/3rd " "
Opium	3,00,000	1/20th " "
Land Revenue	2,62,543	1/10th " "
Excise	1,94,144	1/20th " "
Stamps	3,92,447	1/10th " "
Forests	1,44,358	1/10th " "
Registration	10,197	1/10th " "
Payments from Indian States	3,61,739	1/20th " "
N. W. R. (Actual Central Receipts)	4,43,64,000	
Irrigation Receipts (Actual Central Receipts)	1,53,501	
Posts and Telegraphs	1,91,26,202	1/6th " "
Debt Services	4,32,408	1/20th " "
Civil Administration	10,05,663	1/10th " "
Currency and Mints	11,69,016	1/10th " "
Civil Works	3,02,518	1/10th " "
Miscellaneous	3,18,361	1/20th " "
Defence Receipts	26,02,662	1/20th " "
Total	24,52,79,762	

The table below shows the estimated revenues of the Sind Regions as based on the budget estimates of the Government of India for the year 1939-40. It will help the reader to have a fuller grasp of the financial aspect of Pakistan. Again these estimates are based on the minimum of expectation from our various sources of revenue.

Pakistan Revenue as based on 1939-40 Budget. Estimates of the Government of India.

	Rs.	
Customs	10,16,25,000	1/4th of Central Receipts
Central Excise	41,40,000	1/20th
Salt	2,78,33,333	1/3rd
Corporation Tax	9,40,000	1/20th
Income-Tax	1,28,80,000	1/10th
Opium	2,45,750	1/20th
Other Heads	10,13,600	1/10th
N. W. R. (Net earnings)	5,50,87,000	" "
Irrigation	7,700	1/10th
Posts and Telegraphs	2,23,16,666	1/6th
Debt Services	3,16,150	1/20th
Civil Administration	10,37,700	1/10th
Currency and Mints	6,72,200	1/10th
Civil Works	3,09,700	1/10th
Miscellaneous	6,98,250	1/20th
Defence Services	4,37,630	1/20th
Provincial contributions	" "
Extraordinary items	14,77,850	1/10th
Total ...	23,10,38,529	

After separation on account of lack of indigenous industries, our regions will increasingly attract foreign imports. This will enhance our income from Karachi customs to help our finances in the beginning. Later when our own industries will develop, they will give us new sources of income and the said source of income on account of foreign imports will be automatically replaced by them.

At present we have open frontiers between our regions and the rest of India. Foreign as well as Indian manufactures enter our regions free of any tariff duties. Under Section 297 of the Government of India Act of 1935 we cannot levy any discriminative tariff against their entry. After separation most probably the articles of Indian manufacture will continue to move into our trade blocks over Rail and Road but they will not be allowed to cross the frontiers without paying any duties as at present. This will be an additional source of central revenues. As regards the foreign manufactures which are transported into our regions after their entry into India through ports other than Karachi, in all probability they will seek entry into the Sind Regions direct through Karachi. This would again mean diversion of a large volume of trade from other Indian ports into Karachi with the result that our customs income will considerably increase. We can roughly estimate the total increase affected by the increased import trade and land frontier customs in our receipts at about three crores of rupees. An addition of three crores to our foregoing estimated revenues will make our total receipts about Rs. 26,00,00,000. This will show that in estimating our revenue receipts at Rs. 22,00,00,000 as in the book, 'Confederacy of India,' we have left too wide a margin and consequently little scope for adverse criticism."

Muslim Countries in Favour of Separation

"Some time back the Secretary, Majlis-i-Kabir, Pakistan, received a letter from the learned Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru. In this letter the Pandit Ji has raised a few objections against the Movement: the most important

among them being that no Muslim country in the world has advocated it and that some of the prominent Muslim organisations in India have not approved of it. A movement for the unification of the Muslim world (Silsila-i-Jamia-i-Vahdat Umam Islam) was started in Turkey during the lifetime and at the instance of late Ataturk under the patronage of the late Sayed Jalil Ahmad Sinyusi. We draw the attention of Pandit Ji to the aims and objects of this movement. One of its aims is to create more Muslim republics in all those parts of the world which are predominantly Muslim, in addition to the Muslim states already functioning. These new republics which have been proposed to be established by the advocates of the aforesaid movement are:—

- (1) Surya Republic: consisting of Syria, Palestine and Transjordan.
- (2) Sinyusia Republic: to be constituted by Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco and Libia.
- (3) Azarya Republic: consisting of Azarbaijan, Daghistan and Crimea.
- (4) Turanian Republic: consisting of Eastern and Western Turkistan, etc.
- (5) Aqsa Republic: consisting of Muslim provinces of China.
- (6) Barghashia Republic: consisting of the Muslim tracts of East Africa.
- (7) Haidrya Republic: to be constituted by the Hyderabad State, etc.
- (8) Muhammadiya Republic: to be constituted by the Muslim Bengal.
- (9) Java Republic: consisting of the Isles of Java, Sumatra and Borneo.
- (10) Islamistan Republic (Pakistan): to be constituted by the Muslim North-West India.

Thus we see that in the programme of the said 'Silsila' the Muslim areas of the Sind Regions are included under the name 'Islamistan' and that it is quite apparent that the Muslim world is anxious to see not only the Sind Regions free but also the other Muslim parts of the world. As to the Muslim organisations which have not approved of the idea of separation, the separationists regard them as not yet sufficiently enlightened on the subject. Most prominent among the organisations to which the learned Pandit Ji has referred in his letter as averse to the idea of separation is Majlis-i-Ahrar. No doubt, this Muslim organisation has some influence among the Muslims and its opinions also carry some weight with them. But the question is whether that organisation is really opposed to it. In his presidential address, delivered at Peshawar, Chaudhri Afzal Haq Sahib, President of the Majlis-i-Ahrar, stated that they, the Ahrars, are not opposed to the separation idea. What they wanted is that separation should be demanded after independence has been achieved so that they might achieve self-government along with India. In other words, the Ahrars for the present want to remain within India for they think that by doing so they would get self-government more quickly than if they stood alone. This again means that they want to postpone the question of separation to some later date and that ultimately their aim is also to secede from the Hindu India. The difference between them and the separationists, therefore, is that while the former, for the time being, want to postpone the demand of separation to some later date, the latter are of opinion that it is better to achieve it under the constitution, while the British are here, for after they have left India, it will not be conceded without bloodshed and civil war, an eventuality which will tremendously increase the risk of India's once again passing into the hands of some third expansionist power."

The Idea of 'Separation' Has Regularly Developed

"We also hear some opponents of the movement saying that this is a new-fangled idea of some unrealistic minds. We claim that it has been in existence ever since the times of Jamal-ud-Din Afghani and is at least three-quarters of a century old. It has been taking expression through the mouths of various Muslim leaders at various times. In 1906 when the All-India Muslim League was formed, it was this idea which was working under the demand for the creation of such an organisation. In 1908 when the League demanded separate representation for their community, from Lord Minto, they in reality were demanding separation. Again in 1916 when separate representation was made the basis of the Lucknow Pact by such leaders as the late Mian Fazl-i-Husain and others, it was in fact the separatist tendencies of the Muslims which urged those leaders to stress the need of separate representation for their community and to get recognition for this principle. When after the 1919 Reforms the late Mian Fazl-i-Husain in the Punjab and other Muslim leaders elsewhere in India tried to implement the terms of the Lucknow Pact, in reality they were goaded on to pursue their so-called communal programme by the functioning of this idea in their sub-conscious mind. Again in 1930 the late Shaikh Muhammad Iqbal clearly envisaged it and portrayed it before the Muslims in his presidential address at the time of the annual session of the All-India Muslim League, held at Allahabad. And now it is everywhere in the air."

The Muslims Claim to be a Nation

They Claim Territory (Pakistan) as their right as a Nation

The Rights of a Community & the Rights of a Nation

"That the distinction between a Community and a Nation is fundamental is clear from the difference in the political rights which political philosophers are prepared to allow to a Community and those they are prepared to allow to a Nation, against the Government established by law. To a Community they are prepared to allow the right of insurrection only. But to a Nation they are willing to concede the right of disruption. The distinction between the two is as obvious as it is fundamental. A right of insurrection is restricted only to insisting on a change in the mode and manner of government. The right of disruption is greater than the right of insurrection and extends to the secession of a group of the members of a State with a secession of the portion of the State's territory in its occupation (a)... The difference comes to this : a community has a right to safeguards, a nation has a right to demand separation. (b)"

Sidgwick in his ELEMENTS OF POLITICS (1929, pp. 646-47) justified a community's right to insurrection in these words:

"... the evils of insurrection may reasonably be thought to be outweighed by the evils of submission, when the question at issue is of vital importance... an insurrection may sometimes induce redress of

The foregoing extracts under the heads

'Opposed Economic Interests'

'Financially the Scheme is Sound'

'Muslim Countries in favour of Separation'

'The Idea of Separation has regularly developed'

have been taken from "SEPARATION—A Reply to its Critics", by 'A. Punjabi' pages, 10-12, 25-32, 14-16, and 16-17, respectively.

(a) "THOUGHTS ON PAKISTAN" by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, page 328.

(b) " " " " " 329.

grievances, even when the insurgents are clearly weaker in physical force; since it may bring home to the majority the intensity of the sense of injury aroused by their actions. For similar reasons, again a conflict in prospect may be anticipated by a compromise; in short, the fear of provoking disorder may be a salutary check on the persons constitutionally invested with supreme power under a democratic as under other forms of Government. I conceive then that a moral right of insurrection must be held to exist in the most popularly governed community." (a)

This is what Sidgwick has to say on the right to disruption:

"...Some of those who hold that a government to be legitimate must rest on the consent of the governed, appear not to shrink from drawing this inference: they appear to qualify the right of the majority of members of a state to rule by allowing the claim of a minority that suffers from the exercise of this right to secede and form a new state, when it is in a majority in a continuous portion of its old state's territory....and I conceive that there are cases in which the true interests of the whole may be promoted by disruption. For instance, where to portions of a State's territory are separated by a long interval of sea, or other physical obstacles, from any very active intercommunication, and when, from differences of race or religion, past history, or present social conditions, their respective inhabitants have divergent needs and demands in respect of legislation and other governmental interference, it may easily be inexpedient that they should have a common Government for internal affairs, while if, at the same time, their external relations, apart from their union, would be very different, it is quite possible that each part may lose more through the risk of implication in the other's quarrels, than it is likely to gain from the aid of its military force. Under such conditions as these, it is not to be desired that any pride in the national ownership of an extensive territory, should permanently prevent a peaceful dissolution of the incoherent whole into its natural parts" (b).

".....a community, however different from and however opposed to other communities major or minor it may be, is one with the rest in the matter of the ultimate destiny of all. A nation on the other hand is not only different from other components of the State but it believes in and cherishes a different destiny totally antagonistic to the destiny entertained by other component elements in the State.....A people who notwithstanding their differences accept a common destiny for themselves as well as for their opponents are a community. A people who are not only different from the rest but who refuse to accept for themselves the same destiny which others do, are a nation. It is this difference in the acceptance and non-acceptance of a common destiny which alone can explain why the Untouchables, the Christians and the Parsis are in relation to the Hindus only communities and why the Muslims are a nation." (c)

Muslim National Home—Muslim National State

'According to a leading authority, a NATIONAL HOME connotes a territory in which a people, without receiving the rights of political sovereignty, has nevertheless a recognised legal position and receives the opportunity of developing its moral, social and intellectual ideals.

-
- (a) "THOUGHTS ON PAKISTAN" by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, page 328.
 (b) " " " " " " 329.
 (c) " " " " " " 338.

In the case of a NATIONAL HOME the people who constitute it do not receive the right of political sovereignty over the territory and the right of imposing their nationality on others also living in that territory. All that they get is a recognised legal position guaranteeing them the right to live as citizens and freedom to maintain their culture. In the case of a NATIONAL STATE, people constituting it receive the rights of political sovereignty with the right of imposing their nationality upon the rest.

This difference is very important and it is in the light of this that one must examine the demand for Pakistan. What do the Muslims want Pakistan for? If they want Pakistan to create a National Home for Muslims, then there is no necessity for Pakistan. In the Pakistan Provinces they already have their National Home with the legal right to live and advance their culture. If they want Pakistan to be a National Muslim State, then they are claiming the right of political sovereignty over the territory included in it. This they are entitled to do. But the question is should they be allowed to retain within the boundaries of these Muslim State, non-Muslim minorities as their subjects with a right to impose upon them the nationality of these Muslim States. No doubt such a right is accepted to be an accompaniment of political sovereignty. But it is equally true that in all mixed states this right has become a source of mischief in modern times. To ignore the possibilities of such mischief in the creation of Pakistan and the Eastern Muslim State will be to omit to read the bloody pages of recent history on which have been recorded the atrocities, murders, plunders and arsons committed by the Turks, Greeks, Bulgars, and the Czechs against their minorities. It is not possible to take away this right from a state of imposing its nationality upon its subjects because it is incidental to political sovereignty. But is it possible not to provide any opportunity for the exercise of such a right. This can be done by allowing the Muslims to have National Muslim States but to make such states strictly homogeneous, strictly ethnic states. Under no circumstances can they be allowed to carve out mixed states composed of Muslims opposed to Hindus, with the former superior in number to the latter. . . . Hindus can never be expected to consent to the inclusion of the Hindus in a Muslim State deliberately created for the preservation and propagation of the Muslim faith and Muslim culture. Not only Hindus will oppose but Muslims will be found out. For, Muslims, if they insist upon the retention of the present boundaries, will open themselves to the accusation that behind their demand for Pakistan there is something more sinister than a mere desire to create a National Home or a National State, namely to perfect the scheme of Hindu hostages in Muslim hands by increasing the balance of Muslim majorities against Hindu minorities in the Muslim areas. (a)

Two Indias—Patrick Lacy

Extract from an article entitled "TWO INDIAS" by Mr. Patrick Lacy in the 'Contemporary Review' and in 'The Eastern Times' dated 2nd August, 1940, as reproduced at pages 80-82 of "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION" by Mr. Jinnah:—

"Abdul Ghaffar Khan, leader of the Frontier Red Shirts, once told me his alliance with the Congress was an expedient to be abandoned so soon as it seemed to interfere with Pathan notions of independence; 'for what have we to do with Hindustan.' If that was the mind of a Pathan in British India proper—if the Simon Commission, the Joint Parliamentary Committee and Mr. Jinnah were right—we can hardly expect the militant zealots of Islam in tribal territory to accept laws made by the votes of a Hindu majority in

Delhi. The argument runs that the tribes cannot be wholly subdued except by costly and amoral violence, nor inveighed into an Indian comity, for their own and the general good, if this requires their submission to an alien authority. Rule by a Hindu majority from Madras, Bombay, Bihar, the U.P. and so on would seem at least so alien to them as the present British mixture of bribery, camaraderie and battery. But offer them a square deal and tolerable amenities in their own territory; let them see a Mohammedan Government established at Lahore on principles they can appreciate; let that Government persuade them with such coercion as they make necessary, to co-operate with it in digesting the responsibility and fruits of civilised administration. It is possible that they then at last reconcile themselves to a new and better order of life within an Indian commonwealth. Some people think this could be done without the creation of an independent Pakistan; others are convinced that the bogey of an over-riding, alien, Delhi-made regime would either deter the tribes at the outset, or provoke their secession eventually, from a system of provincial autonomy embracing all India.

Pakistan may be an Utopian dream, or something worse. The arguments against it need no advertisement. But at the same moment it seems to be gaining favour, for reasons, and in a particular manner, that bode nobody any good, whether there is anything to be said for the idea or not. It would be a mistake to assume that all Hindus to a man are opposed to it and will always be ready to resist it. If we believe it to be something worse than a dream, we had better make a reconnaissance flight over its last line of defence, so that we may know exactly what, where and how we must attack it if we want to win our offensive with the minimum cost to either side—or all three sides. This, perhaps, is the last ditch argument.

The unity of India is the artificial creation of a unitary Government imposed from without, whether the binding force is popular approval, submission or antagonism. It is a Good Thing, but not indigenous to the country or natural to its people and history. The British were able to take India because they found it divided against itself. They took a large part of it from the Mussalman Moghuls. They fought a variety of Hindu chieftains. They conquered at times with Muslim allies at others with Hindu allies. The country has never known unity from Gilgit to Trivendrum and from Quetta to Calcutta save in the peace imposed on it by British rule. Many breaches and divisions have been healed, probably for ever; but the fundamental differences between Hindu and Mohammedan remain and look as if they must remain, and it is no more Britain's business to subordinate the one civilisation to the other than to aid the subjection of Bohemia to German Kultur. The alien bond of unity is now about to go and lest its disappearance should release full blast the disintegrating tendencies now reappearing, there is something to be said for redistributing India as fairly, naturally and securely as possible to the rival claimants from whom Britain seized it—and who helped the British in each other's dispossession. In a talk reported to the Manchester Guardian nine years ago Mr. Gandhi spoke with regret, but without noticeable emotion of the possibility that independence might plunge his country into civil strife, and that this might end in the destruction of one community by the other. If that is a possibility, and if the only alternative to it is a choice between two lesser evils, let us decide now what our choice shall be. Let us say we would rather have two free Indian Dominions, each as nearly homogeneous as it can be, than one enormous cockpit of feuds under the ignominy of alien rule."

Hindus and Sikhs in Pakistan

" There is an important Hindu minority in Pakistan. The Pakistani Hindus are true children of the soil and are of the same race as their Muslim fellow-countrymen. They have a fine and liberal religion and practise very little of the caste exclusionism and untouchability of the orthodox Aryo-Dravidian Hindu. The definition of Hinduism quoted by Sir T. W. Holderness which calls it a 'a tangled jungle of disorderly superstitions, ghosts and demons, demi-gods and deified saints, house-hold gods, tribal gods, universal gods, with their countless shrines and temples and the din of their discordant rites—deities who abhor a fly's death and those who delight still in human victims' is certainly not applicable to the religion of the Pakistani Hindu. His is the practice of the Vedas and the post-Vedic scriptures and his worship of the Supreme Being is accompanied with simplified and becoming ritual. Despite the inequalities of caste, contact with the Islamic world has given the Pakistani Hindus a democratic outlook on politics. Their speech like the speech of their Muslim neighbours is besprinkled with sonorous Persian words and verse quotations. The very life of the future state will depend on the loyalty and patriotism of her Hindu sons and daughters. Should they fail her, she may be merged in Dravidian India and the finest race in the world may be left without a home and without a name.

Sikhs are typical Pakistanis. They are of pure Indo-Aryan race and owing to the religious necessity of wearing all their hair possess a markedly distinctive appearance. Most of them are agriculturists and live in villages. Sikhism is a compromise between Hinduism and Islam. Guru Nanak, the great Punjabi pacifist, first preached the Sikh religion and won adherents in the area around Amritsar.... Today Sikhs are found all over Pakistan and, as Prof. Lyde points out give a distinctive tone to the country. By the Census returns of 1931 there are four million three hundred and thirty-six thousand Sikhs living in India. More than ninety-five per cent. of the total Indian Sikh population lives within Pakistan.

Taking India as a whole the Sikhs form less than 1.3 per cent. of its total population. Evidently, so small a minority can exercise no appreciable influence on the cultural and political development of the great sub-continent. It is most unlikely that in a closely federated India the Sikhs will be able to preserve their cultural and religious identity against the pressure of over-whelming numbers.

However, in the event of Pakistan becoming independent, Sikhs will be in a different position. They will be an influential minority of land-holders constituting about nine per cent. of the population. National self-determination for Pakistan will mean National self-determination for the Sikhs and there will be no further danger of their being swamped by over-whelming millions of alien rice-eaters. An independent Pakistan will not only be one of the greatest Muslim powers, she will also be the only Sikh power in the world, and it is for this reason that the Pakistani Muslims look to their Sikh brethren for co-operation in their efforts for liberation of the fatherland." (a)

Azad Punjab—

Lahore, May 3, 1943—On a visit to Lahore one finds prominence given to Sikhs' efforts to get a separate homeland known as "AZAD PUNJAB,"

(a) "PAKISTAN—A NATION" by El Hamza, pages 34-38.

Gyani Kartarsing, Chief Lieutenant of Master Tarasingh, and known as the brain behind the Akali Party, has had several talks with Mr. Jinnah to make the Muslim leader accept the Sikh claim, and secure Sikh support for Pakistan—support which the Sikhs have already given in their secret memorandum presented to Sir Stafford Cripps. It was this memorandum which brought about the appointment of a Sikh member to the Viceroy's Council for the first time last year.

The Hindus in the Punjab seem opposed to both Pakistan and Azad Punjab for the Sikhs.

The Sikhs are also getting into an alliance with the Muslim League in the Frontier Province to form a Ministry there.

There is a serious move to have a Muslim League Ministry in the Punjab with an alliance with Akalis and such Hindus as join it even if Sir Chhotu Ram, Deputy Leader of the Unionist Party, has to be thrown out. Mr. Jinnah's efforts are directed to that end and the Punjab Muslim Ministers, after their return from the League session, realise that they cannot very long withstand Mr. Jinnah's demands for a Muslim League Ministry. (a)

The Hindu is Hindu and the Muslim is Muslim and ne'er the twain shall meet !

Extract from the Presidential Address of Malik Barkat Ali, M.A., LL.B., M.L.A., at the Lyallpur Pakistan Conference, held on the 20th July, 1941 :

'The question arises, why did the All-India Muslim League which from its foundation right upto 1937 had been placing before the Muslims of India the goal of a free and independent United India, with Hindus and Muslims as common citizens of the State, the joint custodians of the honour and integrity of this vast country, should have turned an absolutely new leaf in its history and should have adopted the very scheme of Partition, actually put forward by Dr. Sir Mohammad Iqbal in 1930, which, at the time it was put, the League-Leaders (b) opposed and condemned as 'sounding the death knell of all that was noble and lasting in modern political activity in India,' and which the League continued to oppose right until 1937? I propose to answer this question. . . . True, that ten years ago, we of the Muslim League were wedded to the ideal of a United India and that we had laboured throughout for preserving the integrity and inviolability of India. Why have we changed? We have changed, let our critics bear in mind, because our experience of the Congress Governments in the seven Congress governed provinces from July, 1937 to October, 1939, when they were in power shattered all our confidence in the good faith of our Hindu countrymen. The Deliverance Day that we celebrated on 22nd December, 1939 marked our final rupture with Hindu India and relegated us back to the position of those who had always preached that Hinduism and Islam were two separate cultures, that Hindus and Muslims were two separate nations and that the coalescence of the two was an impossibility. We trusted you, according to our good natures, as far as it was possible for human nature to do so; we disregarded the repeated warnings we have had in the past; pace the opposition to the grant of Reforms to the N.-W.F.P. Province, the opposition to the creation

(a) Vide *The Daily Gazette*, Karachi, dated the 4th May, 1943.

(b) Malik Barkat Ali's views in 1931, appear later in this Chapter.

of Sindh and Baluchistan as separate provinces, the controversy over the lodging of Residuary Powers, and finally the opposition to the grant of Muslim majorities in the Bengal and Punjab legislatures. But we continued to cherish the dream of a United India, refusing to believe what seems to have been ordained by an unalterable Destiny, namely, that the Dream was one emanating from the Gate of Ivory. It was only after those terrible experiences of July, 1937 to October, 1939 with the Apostle of Non-Violence presiding over and auspicating the Governments which had committed those unnameable atrocities with his blessings, that we were compelled to bid good-buy to all our cherished hopes and beliefs, to forswear our past convictions and to come down to Mother Earth to realise the plain simple truth, realised earlier by the late Lala Rajpat Rai and others on the opposite side, that the Hindu is Hindu and the Muslim is Muslim and never the twain shall meet. If any body is responsible for this psychological transformation, it is not the Muslim Leaders: It is the Congress Hindu Mentality." (a)

*

*

*

The Inspiration and the Motivating Force Behind Pakistan

"Extract from the Presidential Address of Malik Barkat Ali, M. A., LL. B., M. L. A., at the Lyallpur Pakistan Conference, held on the 20th July, 1941:—

"There is one further objection advanced against our Pakistan Scheme which I should also like to discuss and answer. It is said that the problem of minorities, for which Pakistan is offered as a solution, will still remain, as the authors of the Pakistan proposal do not contemplate any wholesale exchange or shifting of populations. There will be Muslims in Hindu India just as there will be Hindus in Muslim India, and that the provision even of mandatory, effective and adequate statutory safeguards for minorities will be no solution, as, ex-hypothesi, the provision of adequate, effective and mandatory statutory safeguards for the Muslims or other minorities in a scheme of self-government for a United India is not acceptable to the Muslims. Those who put forward this objection forget in the first instance that the idea of Pakistan has not been conceived solely as a solution of this perennially recurring minority problem which has been baffling all attempts at constitution-making for India. The inspiration and the motivating force behind Pakistan is the burning consciousness and the irrepressible desire that the Muslim nation shall see its genius and its soul reflected in the glory of Government, and all those institutions of social happiness which are a part and parcel of the machinery of a durable and lasting Government. Have Indians not peace today under the British Crown? Have they not been enjoying in the past a rule of law approximating as nearly as is possible to the rule of law obtaining in England? And have they not the promise that soon after the war, England will be endowing India with all the apparatus of a self-governing Dominion, giving to Indians as much Freedom as the Englishman enjoys in his own country? And yet do these declarations and promises satisfy Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru or Mahatma Gandhi? Why not? Because in spite of all these declarations and promises, and far beyond them something still remains in the innermost recesses of their political consciousness which the Englishman can never give and which, if not attained,

will leave the peace of their soul disturbed and their happiness unconsummated. That something is what such undefinable expressions as self-determination and self-manifestation connote. This is the Muslim's reply to those friends who would give him all the safeguards that may be needed for the protection of his religious, economic, political, administrative and other interests. Mahatma Gandhi has been promising a blank cheque and yet that blank cheque, whatever it may mean, has given no satisfaction to any Muslim. No promise of the fullest protection can suppress this natural and inevitable urge for self-manifestation and self-expression. That is why the Muslims demand a complete release from the control of any centre, no matter how aenimic. It is of the essence of Pakistan that there shall be no centre, and that the Muslim States, which will be carved out to satisfy the Muslims' natural urge and desire for self-manifestation, shall be completely free and sovereign. To say, therefore, that Pakistan is designed and offered as solution primarily of the minority question in India, is really a misstatement of the problem. Undoubtedly, Pakistan will settle the bulk of this minority question, leaving only a small part behind, which perhaps will get itself automatically solved, as soon as the Hindus and Muslims are set in their separate houses as complete masters. The sense of neighbourliness and the obligation to jointly shoulder the responsibility of keeping India free and immune from all foreign domination will act as powerful checks to restrain both the Hindu and the Muslim from molesting any of their Muslim or Hindu subjects. And if the Hindus or Muslims still persist in each other's persecution, natural laws will come into operation and put an end to any such intolerable state of affairs. No one need be afraid of wars between Hindu India and Muslim India, but if ever they come, they will certainly act as powerful solvents of the poison which must have accumulated to make those wars possible. Have wars not taken place in Europe and has the possibility of war rendered any the nearer the dream of a European Federation? No big Power of Europe contemplates any European Federation nor has the possibility of wars reconciled any of them to the idea of entrusting their freedom and their independence to any composite super-state. Is India not as big as Europe minus Russia and why can't be there two powerful states, Hindu India and Muslim India, to settle their differences, if ever they arise, by the process of diplomatic negotiations, and in the end, by the arbitrament of the sword if all other methods of settling the dispute fail? I can quite see that Mahatma Gandhi with his doctrine of Non-violence and those who follow him will run away and refuse to be parties to such speculation. But, remember that the doctrine of Non-violence is but a rule of the vegetable kingdom and has no place in the story of Nations. If nations reject and deride or offend against the moral law, there is a penalty provided which must overtake them. The penalty may not come at once, but rely upon it, the great Italian was not a poet only but a Prophet when he said

‘The sword of Heaven is not in haste to smite
Nor yet doth linger’

I repeat, therefore, that the objection to Pakistan that it leaves unsolved the minority or Hindu-Muslim question is based on a complete misunderstanding of the inspiration and the motive force behind Pakistan. We certainly do not contemplate any wholesale migrations of populations, but there is nothing to prevent those Hindus and Muslims

who may not like to live under Muslim or Hindu Government to migrate to and settle under their own national Governments. Perhaps, as the result of experience, this migration may become inevitable. Has not Europe resorted to wholesale migrations of the populations to end the racial troubles which have so often afflicted her in the past and a disregard of which led to those pogroms and blood-curdling butcheries that disfigure the pages of European history? Let us take a lesson from Europe and cease to indulge in such frivolities when face to face with the master problem of self-determination for the two big nations of India."

(The Indian Annual Register, 1941, Vol. II, Pages 233-34)

Pakistan adopted by the Sind Legislative Assembly

The Sind Legislative Assembly adopted the following resolution on Pakistan on the 2nd March, 1943, the Hindu members in the Opposition having staged a walkout and the two Hindu Ministers in the Cabinet and a Hindu Parliamentary Secretary having voted against the resolution, with the Congress members away being under detention as security prisoners, and the European members abstaining from voting:—

"This House recommends to Government to convey to His Majesty's Government, through H. E. the Viceroy, the sentiments and wishes of the Muslims of this province that whereas Muslims of India are a separate nation possessing religion, philosophy, social customs, literature, traditions, political and economic theories of their own quite different from those of the Hindus, they are justly entitled to the right, as a single separate nation, to have independent national states of their own, carved out in the zones where they are in majority in the sub-continent of India. Wherefore they emphatically declare that no constitution shall be acceptable to them that will place the Muslims under a Central Government dominated by another nation, as in order to be able to play their part freely on their own distinct lines in the order of things to come, it is necessary for them to have independent national states of their own with safeguards for the minorities and hence any attempt to subject the Muslims of India under one central government is bound to result in disastrous and unhappy consequences." (a)

C O N S

The Political Unity of All-India !

"The political unity of all India, although never attained perfectly in fact, always was the ideal of the people throughout the centuries. The conception of the universal sovereign as the Chakravarti Raja runs through Sanskrit literature and is emphasized in scores of inscriptions. The story of the gathering of the nations to the battle of Kurukshetra, as told in the Mahabharata, implies the belief that all the Indian peoples, including those of the extreme south, were united by real bonds and concerned in interests common to all. European writers, as a rule, have been more conscious of the diversity than of the unity of India. Joseph Cunningham, an author of unusually independent spirit, is an exception. When describing the Sikh fears of British aggression in 1845, he recorded the acute and true observation that 'Hindustan, moreover, from Caubul to the valley of Assam, and the island of Ceylon, is regarded as one country, and dominion in it is associated in the minds of the people with the predominance of one monarch

(a) *The Daily Gazette, Karachi, dated the 4th March, 1943.*

or one race.' India therefore possesses, and always has possessed for considerably more than two thousand years, ideal political unity, inspite of the fact that actual complete union under one sovereign, universally acknowledged by all other princes and potentates, dates only from 1877. The immemorial persistence of that ideal goes a long way to explain the acquiescence of India in British rule, and was at the bottom of the passionate outburst of loyal devotion to their King-Emperor so touchingly expressed in many ways by princes and people in 1911.

The most essentially fundamental Indian unity rests upon the fact that the diverse peoples of India have developed a peculiar type of culture or civilization utterly different from any other type in the world. That civilization may be summed up in the term 'Hinduism.' India primarily is a Hindu country, the land of the Brahmans, who have succeeded by means of peaceful penetration, not by the sword, in carrying their ideas into every corner of India. Caste, the characteristic Brahman institution, utterly unknown in Burma, Tibet, and other border lands, dominates the whole of Hindu India, and exercises no small influence over the powerful Muhammadan minority. Nearly all Hindus reverence Brahmans, and all may be said to venerate the cow. Few deny the authority of the Vedas and the other ancient scriptures. Sanskrit everywhere is the sacred language. The great gods, Vishnu and Shiva, are recognized and more or less worshipped in all parts of India. The pious pilgrim, when going the round of the holy places, is equally at home among the snows of Badrinath or on the burning sands of Rama's Bridge. The seven sacred cities include places in the far south as well as in Hindustan. Similarly, the cult of rivers is common to all Hindus, and all alike share in the affection felt for the tales of the Mahabharata and the Ramayana.

India beyond all doubt possesses a deep underlying fundamental unity, far more profound than that produced either by geographical isolation or by political suzerainty. That unity transcends the innumerable diversities of blood, colour, language, dress, manners and sect.

But the limitations are many. Caste, which, looked at broadly, unites all Hindus by differentiating them from the rest of mankind, disintegrates them by breaking them up into thousands of mutually exclusive and often hostile sections. It renders combined political or social action difficult, and in many cases impossible; while it shuts off all Hindus in large measure from sympathy with the numerous non-Hindu population. The Muhammadans, by far the largest part of the population, being largely converts from Hinduism, are not entire strangers to Hindu ideas. Yet an Indian Muslim may be, and often is, more in sympathy with an Arab or Persian fellow-believer than he is with his Hindu neighbour. The smaller communities, Christians, Jews, Parsees, and others, are still more distant from the Hindu point of view.

Nevertheless, when all allowances are made for the limitations, the fundamental unity of Hindu culture alone makes a general history of India feasible. (a)

The Conception of a Divided India not Islam's Conception of the India to be:—Malik Barkat Ali. (b)

In 1928 there was formed a Nationalist Muslim Party under the leadership of Dr. Ansari. The Nationalist Muslim Party was a step in advance of the

(a) Extract from pages ix-xi of the Introduction to "THE OXFORD HISTORY OF INDIA" by Vincent A Smith, C. I. E.

(b) "THOUGHTS ON PAKISTAN" by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, pages 324-27.

Jinnah wing of the Muslim League and was prepared to accept the Nehru Report, as it was, without any amendments—not even those which Mr. Jinnah was insisting upon. Mr. Barkat Ali who in 1927 was with the Jinnah wing of the League left the same as not being nationalistic enough and joined the Nationalist Muslim Party of Dr. Ansari. How great a Nationalist Mr. Barkat Ali then was can be seen by his trenchant and vehement attack on Sir Muhammad Iqbal for his having put forth in his presidential address to the annual session of the All-India Muslim League held at Allahabad in 1930 a scheme for the division of India which is now taken up by Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Barkat Ali and which goes by the name of Pakistan. In 1931 there was held in Lahore the Punjab Nationalist Muslim Conference and Mr. Barkat Ali was the Chairman of the Reception Committee. The views he then expressed on Pakistan are worth recalling. Reiterating and re-affirming the conviction and the political faith of his party, Malik Barkat Ali said:—

“We believe, first and foremost, in the full freedom and honour of India. India, the country of our birth and the place with which all our most valued and dearly cherished associations are knit, must claim its first place in our affection and in our desires. We refuse to be parties to that sinister type of propaganda which would try to appeal to ignorant sentiment by professing to be Muslim first and Indian afterwards. To us a slogan of this kind is not only bare, meaningless cant, but downright mischievous. We cannot conceive of Islam in its best and last interests as in any way inimical to or in conflict with the best and permanent interests of India. India and Islam in India are identical, and whatever is to the detriment of India must, from the nature of it, be detrimental to Islam whether economically, politically, socially or even morally. Those politicians, therefore, are a class of false prophets and at bottom the foes of Islam, who talk of any inherent conflict between Islam and the welfare of India. Further, howsoever much our sympathy with our Muslim brethren outside India, i. e., the Turks and the Egyptians or the Arabs,—and it is a sentiment which is at once noble and healthy,—we can never allow that sympathy to work to the detriment of the essential interests of India. Our sympathy, in fact, with those countries can only be valuable to them, if India as the source, nursery and fountain of that sympathy is really great. And if ever the time comes, God forbid, when any Muslim Power from across the Frontier chooses to enslave India and snatch away the liberties of its people, no amount of Pan-Islamic feeling, whatever it may mean, can stand in the way of Muslim India fighting shoulder to shoulder with non-Muslim India in defence of its liberties.

Let there be, therefore, no misgivings of any kind in that respect in any non-Muslim quarters. I am conscious that a certain class of narrow-minded Hindu politicians is constantly harping on the bogey of an Islamic danger to India from beyond the N.-W. Frontier passes, but I desire to repeat that such statements and such fears are fundamentally wrong and unfounded. Muslim India shall as much defend India's liberties as non-Muslim India, even if the invader happens to be a follower of Islam.

Next, we not only believe in a Free India but we also believe in a United India—not the India of the Muslim, not the India of the Hindu or of the Sikh, not the India of this community or that community, but the India of all. And as this is our abiding faith, we refuse to be parties to any division of the India of the future into a Hindu or a Muslim India. However much the conception of a Hindu and a Muslim India may appeal and send into frenzied ecstasies abnormally orthodox mentalities of their party, we

offer our full-throated opposition to it, not only because it is singularly unpractical and utterly obnoxious, because it not only sounds the death-knell of all that is noble and lasting in modern political activity in India, but is also contrary to and opposed to India's chief historical tradition.

India was one in the days of Asoka and Chandragupta and India remained one even when the sceptre and rod of Imperial sway passed from Hindu into Moghal or Muslim hands. And India shall remain one when we shall have attained the object of our desires and reached those uplands of freedom, where all the light illuminating us shall not be reflected glory, but shall be light proceeding direct as it were from our very faces.

The conception of a divided India, which, Sir Muhammad Iqbal put forward recently in the course of his presidential utterance from the platform of the League at a time when that body had virtually become extinct and ceased to represent free Islam—I am glad to be able to say that Sir Muhammad Iqbal has since recanted it—must not therefore delude anybody into thinking that is Islam's conception of the India to be. Even if Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal had not recanted it as something which could not be put forward by any sane person, I should have emphatically and unhesitatingly repudiated it as something foreign to the genius and the spirit of the rising generation of Islam, and I really deem it a proud duty to affirm today that not only must there be no division of India into communal provinces but that both Islam and Hinduism must run coterminously with the boundaries of India and must not be cribbed, cabined and confined within any shorter bounds. To the same category as Dr. Iqbal's conception of a Muslim India and a Hindu India belong the sinister proposals of some Sikh communalists to partition and divide the Punjab.

With a creed so expansive, namely, a free and United India with its people all enjoying in equal measure and without any kinds of distinctions and disabilities the protection of laws made by the chosen representatives of the people on the widest possible basis of a true democracy, namely, adult franchise, and through the medium of joint electorates—and an administration charged with the duty of an impartial execution of the laws, fully accountable for its actions, not to a distant or remote Parliament of foreigners but to the chosen representatives of the land,—you would not expect me to enter into the details and lay before you all the colours of my picture. And I should have really liked to conclude my general observations on the aims and objects of the Nationalist Muslim Party here were it not that the much discussed question of joint or separate electorates has today assumed proportions where no public man can possibly ignore it.

"Whatever may have been the value or utility of separate electorates at a time when an artificially manipulated high-propriety franchise had the effect of converting a majority of the people in the population of a province into a minority in the electoral roll, and when communal passions and feelings ran particularly high, universal distrust poisoning the whole atmosphere like a general and all-pervading miasma,—we feel that in the circumstances of today and in the India of the future, separate electorates should have no place whatever."

Note:—Malik Barkat Ali's views on Pakistan appear to have undergone a complete transformation since as will be seen from the extracts from his Presidential Address to the Lyallpur Pakistan Conference on 20th July, 1941 given earlier in this Chapter:

The All-India National League

opposed to the disintegration of India.

Associated Press Message dated New Delhi, 29th November, 1942:—

"Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, President of the All-India National League, re-affirms the League opposition to anything savouring of disintegration of India. He says: 'It seems Mr. Rajagopalachariar is utilising the machinery of the Non-Party Conference to get support for his pet hobby of appeasing Mr. Jinnah and his followers. Some members of the National League, including myself, have already participated in the Non-Party Leaders' Conferences in the belief that the Conference is opposed to the vivisection of India, but things are getting complicated and complex day by day. I trust that the Non-Party Leaders' Standing Committee, to which Mr. Rajagopalachariar was specially invited, will not be persuaded by him to lend their support to his recent activities.'"

(Extract from the Daily Gazette, Karachi, dated the 1st December, 1942)

*

*

*

The All-India Anglo-Indian & Domiciled European Association.

Opposed to the vivisection of India.

Associated Press Message dated New Delhi, 27th November 1942:—

"Mr. Frank Anthony, President, All-India Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European Association, addressing the Allahabad branch of the Association expressed the opposition of his community to vivisection of India. He said that all people who are true lovers of India want to see India happy and united with safeguards for the legitimate interests of the minorities. No constitution, he added, could ever hope for even temporary existence unless its first programme was recognition of the rights and position of every minority in India.

He added that there was widespread tendency among political leaders in India to ignore the position and claims of the Anglo-Indian community. He asserted that his community had a distinct identity as a social, cultural and political entity and this had been recognised through many decades. His community, he concluded, had made a notable contribution to the development of India and any future constitution which overlooked the community would lead to political strife."

(Extract from the Daily Gazette, Karachi, dated the 1st December, 1942).

The National Liberal Federation of India

Extract from the Presidential Address of Sir Bijoy Prasad Singh Roy, ex-Minister, Government of Bengal, at the Annual Session of National Liberal Federation of India at Madras on the 26th December, 1941:—

"The Pakistan movement, as propagated by the Muslim League, is a challenge to the fundamental unity running through the whole continent of India; it is a repudiation of the unity of purpose which underlies the external multitudinous ramifications of society, it encourages an attitude towards life where emphasis is placed on differences and incompatibilities in scorn of the impulse of cohesion. The Pakistan movement is undemocratic as it perpetuates the two-nation theory in the political, economic and social planes. The true way to maintain Hindu-Muslim unity is 'by according due

respect to the true distinctness of the different parts.' Hindu-Muslim friendship is to be viewed not as a mere device for political necessity, but, as Poet Rabindra Nath Tagore stressed, 'it is for the sake of our humanity, for the full growth of our soul, that we must turn our mind towards the ideal of the spiritual unity of man'." (a)

The All-India Hindu Mahasabha

Extract from the undelivered Presidential Address of Mr. V. D. Savarkar for the Annual Sessions of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, Bhagalpur, 25th December 1941:—

"On the whole the time has come when our Muslim countrymen should realise that even in their own interests they should accept the inevitable and should cease amusing themselves with airy nothings. They must know that they are in a minority and that there is not the slightest chance now left for them to reduce the present majority of the Hindus in any appreciable measure. They cannot expect a single seat more either in the Legislatures or in the Government Cabinets than what their population strength today entitled them to have and so far as their claim of cutting off the Punjab and other provinces from India to form them into Pakistan is concerned, well they should take it as feasible or otherwise as much as the claim of the Hindus to annex Afghanistan to Hindusthan once again so as to extend the boundaries of Hindudom right up to Hindukush!" (b)

Sikhs and Pakistan—The All-India Akali Conference

"The All-India Akali Conference held at Attari, Lahore, on 12th February, 1940, passed a resolution 'viewing with deep concern the growing endeavours of certain Muslims to convert the Punjab into a part of Pakistan,' and decided 'to resist such a demand by all possible means.' " (c)

The Khalsa National Party

The Khalsa National Party led by Sir Sundersingh Majithia, Revenue Minister, Punjab, at their meeting at Lahore on 29th March 1940, passed a resolution:—

"That the division of India into Hindu and Muslim independent states, as envisaged by the recent resolution of the Muslim League, was fraught with the most dangerous consequences detrimental alike to the best interests of the various communities and the country as a whole: that the resolution had created a situation which might mean a parting of the ways for the Sikhs and the Muslims with whom the Khalsa National Party had been co-operating in the Provincial Autonomy regime in the best interests of the Province and the Sikh community: that the Party hoped that saner counsels would prevail and a catastrophe that was staring the country in the face would be averted: that it would be the height of audacity for any one to imagine that the Sikhs would tolerate for a single day the undiluted communal Raj of any community in the Punjab which was not only their homeland but also their holy land: that as a logical consequence of the

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1941, Vol. II, page 250.

(b) " " " " 243.

(c) " " " " 1940, Vol. I, page 357.

League resolution, the Sikhs would be fully entitled to claim back the sovereignty of the Punjab which was only held as trust by the British during the minority regime of Maharaja Dalipsingh." (a)

*

*

*

Extract from a Statement by Sardar Baldev Singh, Minister of Development, Punjab, as reported in the Tribune, Lahore, dated 25th November 1942:—

"The Punjab holds the key and communal settlement in this province will end the entire communal problem in India. It is the duty of the Sikhs to take part in discussions with the leaders of the other communities to solve this vexed problem. Sikhs cannot entrust the safeguarding of their rights to members of other communities. The Punjab communal problem can best be settled by local men. Outsiders cannot understand our difficulties. I say this in spite of the fact the Muslim League, by including the Punjab within their scheme of things for Pakistan, have made our Problem an All-India question. But the issue before the Sikhs is simple. Our interests are mainly confined to this province. Pakistan cannot help us, nor Mr. Jinnah's two-nation theory. Much less will the Sikhs agree to consign themselves to the status of a sub-nationality lately expounded. We want to live as equal citizens. We wish to dominate nobody. We shall not be dominated by others. The Sikhs, I make bold to say, are today standing between the fruition of the dream of Pakistan and an undivided India. We have an unsullied reputation for patriotism and national well-being."

Sir Jogendra Singh

Addressing a crowded meeting in the Hindu College in connection with Guru Nanak's birthday celebrations Sir Jogendra Singh said :

"Poor Mr. Jinnah has been rattling his sword in vain. We want to win him with love not for our sake, but for the sake of those who look up to him for guidance. Mr. Jinnah can not deny to the non-Muslim the right of self-determination and to remain in Hindustan. You Mr. Jinnah can form a separate State, but then you will have to forfeit the weightage in the provinces which remain in Hindustan.

I now ask you to stay with us and stand for the integrity of India. But, if you must go, then we say, Please go out at once and no more stand in the way of India's progress. You can claim Pakistan only in a part of the Punjab, on the other side of the Chenab, but remember that most of the tribal stock comes from the same as myself and that blood is thicker than water.

Guru Nanak has enjoined on us neither to be afraid of any one nor to give a chance to others to be afraid of us. We have been told also that, when all other means fail, it is right to unsheath the sword. We have faith in God and in the strong arm of our sons, to guard our frontiers. We believe that to those who belong to God victory attends them, for victory is of God" (b).

*

*

*

Dr. Abdul Latif—The Culture Argument and Safeguards

Dr. Syed Abdul Latif, Ph. D., the author of the 'Cultural Future of India' and 'The Muslim Problem in India', regards the safeguards provided in the

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1940, Vol. I, page 357.

(b) The Tribune, Lahore, dated the 25th November 1942.

Congress Resolution on Fundamental Rights adopted at Karachi in 1931 as 'in reality a denial of the organic unity' of India. He emphasises his arguments in the following words:—

'Religion, personal law and culture cover most of the major fields of life's activity—the spiritual, the social, the economic, the educational (or the intellectual, moral and æsthetic), and in the case of the Muslims professedly the political as well. It is governed by their all-embracing Code of life called the Sheriyat. Under the Congress promise the interests of this Sheriyat will have to be safeguarded....With cultural safeguards conceded to the Muslims, and in like manner to the Hindus, Christians and others, you really establish a federation of culturally autonomous nationalities, and do not form a single nationality.'

"To get a complete idea of Dr. Latif's scheme it has to be noticed that he cannot do without safeguards. Mention of these, provision for these, are necessary in the case of 'individuals belonging to one or other of the several nationalities' who may have 'to stay where they are for various purposes'. Such persons and individuals are to be afforded 'security of personal and cultural interests' under a 'Public Law of Indian Nations' adopted by the Central Government. The Indian Christians, Anglo-Indians, Harijans, Parsees and Buddhists are promised the same consideration in each Free State 'through all the necessary religious or cultural and economic safeguards'....Dr. Latif's recognition of the principle of safeguards to be religiously observed both in Hindu and Muslim Zones cuts at the root of his argument about its inapplicability to the 'cultural safeguards' promised in the Congress resolution on Fundamental Rights adopted at Karachi in 1931. If an individual or group or groups of individuals can be guaranteed safety of cultural individuality in the future Federation of India as adumbrated in Dr. Latif's pamphlet 'The Cultural Future of India', it is difficult to understand why the 60 or 70 lakhs of Muslims at present living in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh cannot live secure under the same or identical guarantees, and the one crore and more of Hindus and Sikhs in the Punjab. If the principle is valid in the case of a few, it can be or ought to be valid in the case of millions." (a)

The following is a quotation from "MODERN MOVEMENTS IN ISLAM" by Julius Germinus, Ph. D., Nizam Professor of Islamic Studies, Visva Bharati, Santiniketan, Bengal:—

"The inspiration for progress in Islamic Culture came from outside Arabia and had its origin in non-Arab sources....Only deserts can remain isolated, and only deserts can shelter a society separated by its ancestral and pristine exclusiveness from the rest of mankind." (b)

* * * * *

The Azad (Independent) Muslim Conference

At the session of the Azad (Independent) Muslim Conference, invited jointly on behalf of the Jamiat-ul-Ulama, the all-India organisation of Muslim divines and scholars, the Majlis-i-Ahrar-i-Islam, the Independent Party of Bihar, the Krishak-Proja Party of Bengal, the All-India Momin Conference, the Anjuman-i-Watan of Baluchistan, and the Central Standing Committee of the All-India Shia Conference held at Delhi in April 1940, the President, Mr. Allah Bakhsh, ex-Premier of Sind, claimed his Indian heritage, because the majority, more than 90 per cent., of the eight crores of

the Indian Muslims were "descendants of the earlier inhabitants of India.....in no sense other than sons of the soil with the Dravidians and the Aryans, and have as much right to be reckoned among the earliest settlers of this common land."

On the assurance of this historic fact he claimed that

"no segregated or isolated region, but the whole of India, was the homeland of all the Indian Musalmans, and no Hindu or Muslim or any other had the right to deprive them of one inch of their common homeland." (a)

The following resolutions were passed at the above Conference:—

"This Conference considers that any scheme that divides India into Hindu India and Muslim India is impracticable and harmful to the country's interests generally and those of Moslems in particular.

This Conference is convinced that the inevitable result of such a scheme will be that obstacles will be created in the path of Indian freedom and British Imperialism will exploit it for its own purpose." (b)

"This Conference of representatives of Indian Muslims who desire to secure the fullest freedom for their country consisting of delegates and representatives from all provinces, after having given its fullest and most careful consideration to all the vital questions affecting the interests of the Muslim community and the country as a whole declares the following:—

India, with its geographical and political boundaries, is an indivisible whole and as such it is the common homeland of all the citizens, irrespective of race or religion, who are joint owners of its resources. All nooks and corners of the country contain the hearths and homes of the Muslims and the cherished historic monuments of their religion and culture which are dearer to them than their lives. From the national point of view, every Muslim is an Indian. The common rights of all the inhabitants of the country and their responsibilities in every walk of life and in every sphere of activity are the same. The Indian Muslim by virtue of these rights and responsibilities is unquestionably an Indian national and in every part of the country he is entitled to equal privileges with all other Indian nationals in every sphere of governmental economic and other national activities. For that very reason Muslims owe equal responsibility with other Indians for striving and making sacrifices to achieve the country's independence. This is a self-evident proposition, the truth of which no right-thinking Muslim will question.

This Conference declares unequivocally and with all the emphasis at its command that the goal of Indian Muslims is complete independence along with the protection of their religious and communal rights and they are anxious to attain this goal as early as possible. Inspired by this aim, they have in the past made great sacrifices.

This Conference unreservedly and strongly repudiates the baseless charge levelled against Indian Muslims by the agents of British Imperialism and others that they are an obstacle in the path of Indian freedom and emphatically declares that the Muslims are fully alive to

their responsibility and consider it inconsistent with their tradition and derogatory to their honour to lag behind others in the struggle for the country's independence." (a).

Our Destinies are Linked Together—Sir Sultan Ahmed

Extract from the Address delivered by Sir S. Sultan Ahmed, Kt., D.L., at the Convocation of the Aligarh Muslim University on 21st December 1940:—

"And please do not forget that at this momentous hour lesser things that have loomed so large recently on your mental horizon must assume their right proportions in the scheme of your life. They are comparatively trivial: and if there are differences between you and others the tragedy that is being enacted in Europe should make you realise how dangerous and mischievous they can be, on what a shallow conception of life they are built up, how completely they are founded upon ugly passions, insignificant ambitions and a total lack of human emotions. We realise that since life is what it is and men are what they are, these passions and jealousies will unfortunately be there. But today in our country they have assumed a gigantic magnitude. This deplorable state of affairs must disappear completely if we want progress of any sort in India. It was expected that in the face of the present danger these differences would be forgotten, and then under the influence of a united effort disappear permanently. After all when a tiger is roaming at large people do not quarrel about their share in the communal food supply, for they realise that if they do not unite and destroy the animal there would be no longer a question of food supply for them, whereas a similar problem of the tiger will have been solved. But that is what we seem to be doing at the moment here, and those who were expected to introduce a saner frame of mind seem to me to be aggravating the symptoms of unreasonableness. To state the situation frankly, a great deal has been made of cultural differences between Hindus and Muslims and the impossibility of a compromise between the two. Now there is no doubt as has been stated before, that in India there are different cultural forces at work, not the least important among them being the modern European civilisation. There is no doubt also, that due to the very great influence religion has been on the life of the Muslims in India as elsewhere, their art, their poetry, and their way of life is very largely designed after Arabian and Persian patterns. But that does not mean that culturally the Muslim is a complete alien to Indian traditions, thought and art, nor does a United National Evolution mean the disappearance of the two religions. After all individuals are differently constituted, yet they do co-operate and work harmoniously together. Why should not communities with certain distinct and different religions do so? Why cannot individuals keep their intimate and private life disentangled from the public life, and why should not Hindus and Muslims keep their religion which after all is a man's private relationship with his God or gods separate from their civic and political life? If you look at the Hindu-Muslim problem from a common sense point of view the problem as such is not insoluble or all-pervading. If we desire to find out only differences, big, small and insignificant, between a Muslim and a Hindu, and if the largeness of those differences can be the measure of our satisfaction, we can make most wonderful discoveries. As an illustration, just look to what we have deliberately done to our common language. Urdu has been the mother

tongue of the Hindus and Muslims for centuries. The very name and history of its growth shows that this language was the result of the contact of the Hindus and Musalmans in India, yet unfortunately insidious attacks were made on this language treating it as the language of the Musalmans of India and a propaganda for an artificial Hindustani language which was not the language of anybody in India was started and is being given effect to. What has been the result? The Musalmans unfortunately started stuffing in the Urdu language Arabic and Persian words which were absolutely unnecessary and in many cases have undoubtedly spoilt its charm. I claim that the Right Hon'ble Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and I speak Urdu but the Urdu which has been used by some Urdu papers will not be understood either by him or by me. Here we find a deliberate attempt by extremists of both communities to create a split where no difference existed. In a country like India with a population of over 350 millions, we can even find materials to support the wildest and most fantastic statements of Miss Mayo; but is it at all helpful or useful in the present world conditions? I suggest that the other line of approach, which is to emphasise points of agreement, will lead to greater justice, happiness and satisfaction to both communities in every walk of life, social, economic and political.

There is no gainsaying the fact that racially and politically we are all Indians, we breathe in the same atmosphere and till the same land. We are inheritors of the same old proud civilisation and whatever we may privately think and aspire after, our destinies are linked together. That differences there are I have already admitted, but our foundations of life are the same. Our political and social salvation can only lie in both Hindus and Muslims pooling their energies together for the reconstruction of a better India. However much you try there is no other road to salvation. Any other road will lead India to chaos, anarchy, bloodshed and perpetual subjection.

From a practical viewpoint too, even taking for granted the pessimistic view of irreconcilable differences between Muslims and Hindu cultures, there can be no other means of a better future for India. No amount of wishful thinking will perform the miracle of the total disappearance of millions of Muslims or Hindus from our landscape. For better or for worse 'till death do us part'—that is our destiny. Even in such a situation the only sane and graceful thing is to arrive at some sort of working compromise, at any rate till the duration of the war. A compromise always indicates mutual generousities, a whole series of give and take, concessions and sacrifices. The peace and concord that a compromise like that begets is a sufficient reward for all self-denials. And I conjure you earnestly, all young men, both Hindus and Muslims, to remember this hard, sane and incontrovertible fact when you enter a larger sphere of life. You must try to promote mutual understanding, mutual trust and mutual love and to remember your mutual obligations. Otherwise the example of Europe today is before you. What racial arrogance and racial intolerance can do is being vividly enacted before your eyes. Do not take up a defeatist attitude. With a broad-minded approach our domestic differences can be and must be solved. The determination to solve them has to be found, and once it is found, it will restore the chapter of friendliness, cordiality and even affection between the two communities which unfortunately has been closed in recent years. Remember, time is a great factor in destroying the totalitarian powers, and a United India will work the double miracle of bringing about their downfall and bringing India closer to the goal of political and economic freedom." (a)

The All-India Depressed Classes Conference

Amritsar, April 12, 1943,—The Pakistan, the Azad Punjab and other separatist schemes were condemned in a resolution adopted by the All-India Depressed Classes Conference, Mr. H. J. Khandekar presiding. The resolution was moved by Mr. Chet Ram, M.L.A., of Allahabad, and seconded by B. Dular Chand Ram of Bengal.

By another resolution the Conference demanded the release of Mahatma Gandhi and other Congress leaders for the solution of the deadlock and the establishment of an all-parties government in India. The resolution was moved by Mr. Aghnibhoj of Bombay and seconded by Mr. Matte of the Central Provinces.

The Conference demanded complete independence for India and described as 'absolutely baseless' the official statement that the Depressed Classes were opposed to the demand for the independence of the country.

The Conference also demanded equal rights for the Depressed Classes from the Caste Hindus and appealed to Government for representation in services in proportion to their population.—A. P. (a)

The Muslim Majlis

Calcutta, June 16, 1943—Khan Bahadur Shaikh Mohammed Jan, M.L.C., President, Muslim Majlis, issued the following statement explaining the aims and objects of the Majlis:—

"The Muslim Majlis has been founded (i) to achieve independence for India politically and economically so that each and every community may develop itself socially and culturally according to its religious conception and each province, including the Muslim majority provinces, may enjoy complete independence subject to the control at the Centre in conformity with the powers assigned to it by the provinces unanimously for the common good; (ii) to safeguard Muslim rights and privileges not only on the basis of numerical strength of the Musalmans of India but also according to the special position of the Muslim community in India and its importance in this sub-continent; (iii) to oppose partition of India as it is not only impracticable and negative to India's independence, but is also against the best interests of the Musalmans of India. Divided India can never become independent either economically or politically, and Musalmans will be the worst sufferers by forced seclusion and all-round hostility.

I appeal to all sincere well-wishers of the community who agree with the aims and objects of this organisation to form Muslim Majlis in each district and town not only in Bengal but all over India and create tremendous public opinion in favour of communal settlement on honourable terms so that the present regime of Ordinances may come to an end and real national governments both at the Centre and the provinces may be formed to help the war effort, and deal a final knock-out blow to the Axis powers." (b)

South India Anti-Separation Conference

The following is the main resolution adopted by the South India Anti-Separation Conference at Kumbakonam on the 8th June 1941:—

"It is the considered view of Musalmans from all parts of South India assembled at the Conference that the two-nation scheme of Pakistan,

(a) Vide The Daily Gazette, Karachi, dated the 13th April, 1943.

(b) " " " " " 17th June 1943.

envisaged in the resolution of the Muslim League, would not only not serve the interests of the Muslim community in India for which purpose it is avowedly declared, but would also be definitely detrimental to its growth, expansion and solidarity and would further result in disintegration of the whole country which has all along been geographically and politically an integral unit and has been treated as such, and that it would eventually lead to internal strife, thereby exposing the country to foreign exploitation."

The Conference, by a second resolution, strongly condemned all attempts, by whomsoever made, to vivisect India on any grounds such as ethical, religious, etc.

The third resolution stated:—

"This Conference is emphatically of opinion that the claims of the All-India Muslim League to represent the entire Muslim community of India are not justified as a major section of the Muslim community has never subscribed to the policy of the All-India Muslim League."

The Conference also declared by another resolution that:—

"it is strongly opposed to all constitutional schemes for the future governance of India that are not based on the fact that India is an indivisible nation." (a)

Division of India No Salvation—Mahomed Yusuf Shareef

Extracts from the Presidential Address of Mr. Mahomed Yusuff Shareef, ex-Minister of the Central Provinces, at the South Indian Anti-Separation Conference held at Kumbakonam on the 8th June 1941:—

"The division of India into Muslim and Hindu States, instead of pacifying and strengthening India, will create internal cauldron eternally on the boil, both with passionate recriminations and internecine wars, and how long will the independence of such a country last? No, in the division of India there is no salvation either for the country as a whole or for any community. The more India thinks in terms of separate communities, the more will mutual suspicions be accentuated.

The scheme does not offer any solution whatever for the Muslims living in parts other than the North-West and in North-East of the country. The Hindu-Muslim problem will continue to trouble nearly one-third of the Muslims of this country, and if all that is said about the Congress or majority oppression of the Muslims is true, the proposed division will all the more intensify the oppression. In other words, the remedy proposed by the two-nations scheme would be worse than the disease itself."

Examining the principle of dividing India into separate communal States, Mr. Shareef affirmed that it was obviously impossible that the entire Hindu or Muslim population of any province could be migrated from one region to another. If, however, that could be accomplished, he asked whether the North-Western and North-Eastern (Muslim) States and the Mid-Northern and Central and Southern Hindu States would attain economic self-sufficiency and develop enough political power to enable them to resist the pressure of external aggression—"How will they fare in this competitive world in matter of international trade and protection of the rights of their nationals?"

Proceeding, the President said:—

"If, on the other hand, it is contemplated that the minorities will stay where they are, then how are the States to be constituted? There is no province where one community is uniformly in the majority in the whole of its area. There are districts in the Punjab towards the North-West where Muslims dominated, others to the South-East where the Hindus and Sikhs outnumbered the Muslims. Same is the case in Bengal. The League's resolution no doubt provides for adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards in the constitution for minorities for the protection of their rights and interests. But that would make no change. The minorities problem would remain exactly as exists today even after the creation of the Muslim and Hindu States as contemplated under the League Scheme. (a)

*

*

*

The Anti-Communal Conference, Lahore.

The Anti-Communal Conference held at Lahore on the 9th March 1942, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan presiding, passed a resolution condemning the Pakistan Scheme which, in its view, was "highly unpatriotic, anti-national, and against the best interests of the country."

The Conference expressed the opinion that such schemes were serious obstacles in the path of freedom and called upon every true-minded Indian to spare no pains to explain the harmful effects of such schemes. The Conference condemned the activities of all the communal organisations and censured all such speeches, writings and acts which created inter-communal hatred and enmity, and appealed to all right-minded citizens of India in general and of the Punjab in particular to resist with all their might all such activities which were communal, anti-national, unpatriotic and against the real interests of the country.

By another resolution the Conference expressed the opinion that, while the minorities should be assured of full protection of their religion and culture, there should be no communal representation in the legislatures and the services. There should be no reservation of seats on a communal basis, nor should there be separate electorates. The Conference recorded its protest against the attitude of the Secretary of State for India in placing the communal issue in the forefront. (b)

At the above Conference, referring to the Pakistan Scheme, Diwan Chamanlal, M.L.A., described it as absurd and observed it was untrue to say that the Hindus and Muslims were separate nations. "Most of the Muslim population", he said, "is convert from Hinduism. Even the names of many of them are common. Mr. Jinnah's own community, the Khojas, are such converts and possess common names with the Hindus."

Continuing, Diwan Chamanlal said, "Are we in the Punjab to be told that we Hindus and Muslims differ in culture, dress and speech? You may write down for census and communal purposes that your language is Urdu or Hindi, but each one of you speaks Punjabi—your and my mother tongue. Our mothers and grand-mothers knew no other language. They wore and continue to wear the same dress, live in similar style, eat practically the same food. Are we to be divided from one another in order to preserve the dignity, prestige and position of communal leaders? The masses do not appreciate or understand such cries which pass over their heads. Their concern is with the economic struggle which is common to the masses of all communities. There is no communalism in starvation." (c)

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1941, Vol. I, page 300-01.

(b) " " " " " " " 305.

(c) " " " " " " " 305.

Sir Mirza Ismail on Unity and a Single Nationhood

"Unity, how blessed is that word and that idea, so inspiring, so profoundly necessary to us in India, and so very hard to attain. If there is any real message that I have for you, especially for the young men with whom our future rests, it is just that, throughout this country, we must not, in any sense whatever, be separate; ours must be the virtue, ours the power and the glory of a single nationhood" observed Sir Mirza M. Ismail, Dewan of Jaipur, addressing the Convocation of the Patna University on the 27th November 1942. *Inter alia*, he observed further "It could never be suggested that between Hindus and Muslims and other communities there should be identity either of thought or of custom, for just as I have insisted that a people's vitality must come from the special national source, so the energy and worth of a person must be intimately related to his own religion and tradition. But the prevalent attitude of isolation, of superiority, even intolerance and hostility should give way completely to the positive desire and effort for mutual understanding, respect, and co-operation. . . . They (the graduates of the year) ought to rise superior to excitement and passion, and be able to quiet these in others. They should themselves be thinking men, a rare species, and their thought should make them tolerant and ready for compromise. We believe easily what we fear or what we desire, said a philosopher. To see things from many points of view, to enter into feelings far different from one's own, to understand and care about the ideas and interests of others, though they conflict with one's own, to be as ready to make concessions as to demand them—these are marks of the good man, these are forms of goodness which we positively demand of the graduate of a university." (a)

Addressing the Convocation of the Dacca University on the 2nd December 1942, Sir Mirza Ismail observed, inter alia:

"We rejoice today in the freedom of thinking. But how many in our country are availing themselves of the privilege of thinking? The thought of the country has to be awakened; the youth of the country should take an interest in the great political, religious, social and moral problems. If we can get the young people, throughout the length and breadth of the country, thinking and discussing these great themes, and cultivating a balanced intellectual judgment, our destiny, I believe, is assured. . . . Into a storm-rocked world you, new graduates, have to pass and press forward in a struggle demanding your every effort. But fear not. Be optimistic. Never give way to despair. For things are seldom so bad as we imagine them to be. Let us do our duty well and manfully; uphold righteousness by deed and by word; be both honest and brave; serve high ideals, yet use practical methods. For it is only through hard endeavour that we shall ultimately attain the goal of true national greatness.

In his farewell message to India H. R. H. the Duke of Gloucester referred to the vital importance of unity in India. His Royal Highness's words are so pregnant with meaning that I am tempted to quote them here in full. Recording his personal impression, he said: "The first thing that struck me was that India is a country fashioned by nature to be united. Divided against herself she would be weak; united she can be great and powerful beyond measure. While uniformity is not to be expected in such a vast country, while there is room for difference of race, religion, language, and custom, unity is a necessity; and it seemed to me that already there

(a) *The Daily Gazette, Karachi, 28th November 1942.*

are strong influences at work breaking down the barriers of division and emphasising the fundamental unity of the country. Of these influences the strongest today is War."

If only India can achieve unity! And why not? In unity alone there is freedom and in freedom alone lies real life and happiness.

Anything that a thoughtful and serious man can do, whatever his profession or vocation, to create a feeling of oneness in the country, is probably the most worthwhile thing that he can be doing. The educationist can achieve a great deal by upholding the idea of unity and in moulding the younger generation to a way of life which will lead to the solution of conflicts and the growth of a new and broader outlook. Both inclination and reason place me among the optimists. I believe the future will be better than the past. The destiny of India is unity. Geography, time and common dangers and interests work towards its integration. Indian rivers rise, fall and flow without reference to provincial and State boundaries. Every instrument that science forges from telephone to television jumps frontiers. People cannot be left in compartments in the World of Today, much less in the in the World of Tomorrow. The eternal business of living must go on." (a)

*

*

*

SOME LIKELY PHASES OF PAKISTAN IN OPERATION

Separation and Safeguards will not go Together

"But the brunt of the separation will really fall on the Muslims of the provinces where they are in a minority. The inflamed Hindu feeling will never agree both to partition and also to safeguards for Muslims in the new Hindu State. The basis of safeguards is a common state, a common nationality. If that is denied and disrupted, the claim for safeguards will not be entertained. If safeguard are adequate for two crores of Muslims left in 'Hindustan', they ought to be more than adequate for the nine crore Muslims of (undivided) India—that is how a Hindu will argue. Once Muslims disrupt India and create separate state (s) of their own, they will forfeit the right to separate channels of self-expression in the Hindu State. Pakistan will be agreed to, if at all, only on the condition that in 'Hindustan' the duality of culture and of nationality are given up. Such an attitude of the Hindus may appear unreasonable and 'atrocious' to the Muslim League, but here we enter the twilight zone of Hindu 'feelings'. Separation and safeguards will assuredly not go together." (b)

Other matters for the Muslims to consider

"According to Dr. Rajendra Prasad, 'In the United Provinces and Bihar the Muslim minorities provide a highly cultured class, in no way inferior in intellect, education, culture and even wealth to the Hindus—only they are less in number than the Hindus'. Are they to be left at the mercy of the Hindus? Is it not a fact that these provinces also supply a large proportion of the Muslim intelligentsia of the country? What is going to happen to them?

The 'elite' and the ideologues of the League, mostly drawn from these provinces, will find themselves alien and unwanted in 'Hindustan.' Nor will they be particularly welcome in the Muslim States if the present hostility of the Bengalee Muslims towards their non-Bengalee co-religionists is any indication of the future.

(a) The Daily Gazette, Karachi, dated the 3rd December 1942.

(b) THE COMMUNAL TRIANGLE IN INDIA, by Mehta and Patwardhan, page 212.

It is possible to improve the situation by arranging an exchange of populations.....but the exchange would affect nearly two-thirds of the total population of India. It will mean uprooting humanity on a scale unattempted in history. It is likely to provoke great popular opposition and cause tremendous misery.....if carried out against the wishes of the people concerned, will bring no peace.

Enclaves of the other community will remain in both the Hindu and the Muslim States, whose peace and safety will be jeopardised by the ever-present danger of irredentism. Fear and distrust, with their child terror, will rule the land. The strain of irredentism will be inescapable because even after partition the League hopes to organise and lead the Muslims left in 'Hindustan'. The Hindus are sure to counter this demand with a similar claim. Both States will thus be cursed with a well-knit minority of doubtful loyalty to the State. It will need more than human wisdom to resist the temptation of using this weapon to undermine the strength and cohesion of one State by the other.

With the separation of the predominantly Hindu areas from the Punjab and Bengal, the revenues of Pakistan, according to Dr. Ambedkar, will be halved. To put it in concrete terms, while the revenues of Pakistan and the Eastern Muslim State will be Rs. 60 crores minus Rs. 24 crores (revenues of predominantly Hindu areas), i.e. Rs. 36 crores, the revenues of Hindustan will be Rs. 96 crores plus Rs. 24 crores, i.e. Rs. 120 crores. Not only will the revenues of Pakistan be limited, but their main sources will be inelastic, like land revenue, while elastic and expanding sources, like customs and income-tax, will be meagre.

The *per capita* burden of taxation in Pakistan is already higher than the corresponding figure for Hindustan, Rs. 7.5 as against Rs. 5.3. The trappings of Statehood will greatly enhance this burden.

In the Muslim Zones capital is concentrated mostly with the Hindus. The Hindus of North-West Frontier Province, for instance, contribute 80 per cent of the income tax. In Bengal, nearly three-fourths of the revenue comes from them, while approximately 87 per cent. of the Medical, and 83 per cent. of the Banking, Insurance and Exchange business is in Hindu hands. Will these be expropriated? Any move for expropriation will bring Pakistan into conflict with Hindustan which will be anxious to guard the interests of the Hindu minority in the Muslim State.

The following tabulated description of the division of resources offers a rough and ready picture:—

Food Grains	—	Distinct advantage with Hindustan
Oilseeds	—	Pakistan very deficient
Sugar	—	Substantial advantage with Hindustan
Cotton	—	” ” ” ”
Jute	—	Slightly favourable to Pakistan
Coal	—	Favourable to Hindustan
Iron Ore } Manganese }	—	Practically the whole supply in Hindustan

Thus Pakistan will not only be poorer with regard to agricultural products, its industrial potentialities also will be greatly curtailed. Deficiency of iron and coal will cripple industrial development. To tap the

alternate source, hydro-electricity, will be very costly. Leaving aside the disputed Jute industry, Pakistan will be without cotton, textile, sugar, iron and steel, and chemical industries.

Limited resources, lack of capital, and shrinkage of credit caused by the break-up of India as a whole, will make it well nigh impossible for Pakistan to start an industrial programme or to so re-organise its economy as would be able to combat and overcome the challenge of corrosive poverty.

It is quite possible that the British may, as a counsel of despair, agree to create a Muslim State in the Northern regions of India and agree to separate Pakistan from Hindustan. But this separate Muslim State will never be a free gift from the magnanimous British but only the conditional transfer of insignificant power. Burma did not become free because Burma was separated from India. To hope that Pakistan will meet with a different fate is to show political ignorance." (a)

Mr. Savarkar's reaction to the Pakistan Resolution adopted by the Sind Legislative Assembly

(*Associated Press Message*, dated Bombay, 10th March, 1943, as published in the *Daily Gazette*, Karachi, of 11th March, 1943).

"The resolution regarding Pakistan passed by the Muslim League majority in the Sind Assembly is an indication of a general policy, which is likely to be followed by those few Legislatures and those local or district representative institutions, which the Muslim Leaguers or Muslims in general may happen to hold in their grip," says Mr. V. D. Savarkar, President of the Hindu Mahasabha, in a statement to the Press. He adds: "It has also an importance of its own, which must not be lost sight of. Here in this resolution, the Muslims have recorded definitely through a Legislature, their claim to be a different nation, and made it quite clear that their scheme of Pakistan demands that the Muslim majority provinces are to be altogether cut off from the Indian Nation, which they characterise as a sub-continent and no nation at all and from the Central Indian State, to which they mean to owe no subordination at all. In a way it is desirable that this resolution should have been worded in such an outrageous but frank language so that even those Hindus who, through a process of mental self-deception, hoped against hope inspite of clear warnings of the Hindu Mahasabha that little concessions here and there would finally satisfy the Muslims and then bring about a lasting unity and willing agreement to join us as fellow-citizens of a common Indian State and an Indian Nation.

Now the features of Pakistan depicted on the wall are so bold, that even he who runs may read. Only the blind and the cowardly can still indulge in believing that the deadly serpent may yet prove a coil of rope.

On the other hand, the second fact, which also must be noted, was the unanimous protest recorded by the Hindus against this resolution in the Sind Assembly. I congratulate the two Hindu Sabhai Ministers, in particular, as well as the Hindu Secretary, who inspite of the fact that they formed the Ministry along with the leaders of the League, did not fall victim to the superstition of collective responsibility on such fundamental issues, and boldly opposed the resolution under the full blaze of public searchlight and

(a) "THE COMMUNAL TRIANGLE IN INDIA" by Mehta and Patwardhan, pages 212-219.

recorded votes against the resolution. If collective responsibility is interpreted as the Sind Coalition Ministry including the Leaguers and Hindu Sabhai Ministers have wisely done, then we can continue to work in a common Ministry so far as common issues are concerned and can differ only when any issue so fundamental as the Pakistan crops up. The Hindu Party also proved true to our race, and to the Hindu electorate, which is represented by staging a walk-out in protest of this resolution. They could have done better if they had voted against the resolution.

It is, on the whole, encouraging to see that every Hindu in the Legislature was actuated with a pan-Hindu spirit and acted uncompromisingly where Hindu honour was so intimately involved.

But nevertheless having defended the Hindu cause so unswervingly by voting and protesting against the issue of Pakistan, the Hindu Ministers and Legislators in Sind should not go to the length of resigning their seats either in the Ministry or in the Legislature. That extreme course, instead of weakening the Leaguers, would only help them in pressing their anti-Hindu designs. We are there in the Legislature not at anybody's mercy but by our own electoral right. We should never commit the mistake of voluntarily surrendering all because we could not effectively gain a part of it. Even protesting and voting against an anti-Hindu issue is far more effective when it is done in a Legislature and by Ministers than otherwise.

I urge the Hindu Sabhait and the Hindu Sanghatanist public in general to note with emphasis that this protest by the Hindu members and ministers in the Legislature was only possible because they were all elected on independent 'Hindu' tickets and were not at all tied to the Congress wheels by being elected on a Congress ticket. Had they been Congressite members, they would have, in all likelihood, judging by the proclaimed views and pro-Pakistani resolutions of the Congress itself, either kept neutral as they did in case of the Communal Award in the Central Assembly, or brought some amendments, accepting, in virtue of the Congress resolution, some such detrimental clauses as the acceptance of the principle of provincial self-determination to secede.

Consequently, I call upon all Hindus in Sind to vote always for those Hindus, who publicly pledge to safeguard Hindu interests as Hindus, and never to vote for a Congress candidate, and secondly, to set up a province-wide agitation under the pan-Hindu flag and on a pan-Hindu platform against this Pakistan resolution."

CHAPTER IV

LET THERE BE PAKISTAN

Satan Himself Could not Speak Better

“(a) ‘I take my master Don Quixote for a downright madman; and though sometimes he will talk in a way which, to my thinking, and in the opinion of all who hear him, is so much to the purpose that Satan himself could not speak better, yet for all that, I believe him to be really and truly mad. Now this being so, as in my mind it is, nothing is more easy than to make him believe anything, though it has neither head nor tail’:!....

(Sancho Panza to the Duchess)

‘From what honest Sancho has told me,’ said the Duchess, ‘a certain scruple troubles me, and something whispers in my ear saying, ‘Since Don Quixote de la Mancha is such a lunatic and simpleton, surely Sancho Panza, his squire, who knows it, and yet follows and serves him, relying on his vain promises, must be more mad than his master! Now this being the case, it will surely turn to bad account, Lady Duchess, if to such a Sancho Panza thou givest an island to govern; for how should he who rules himself so ill, be able to govern others?’

‘Faith, madam,’ quoth Sancho, ‘that same scruple is an honest scruple, and need not speak in a whisper, but plain out, or as it lists; for I know it says true, and had I been wise, I should long since have left my master; but such is my lot, or such my evil-errantry. I cannot help it—follow him I must; we are both of the same town, I have eaten his bread, I love him, and he returns my love; he gave me his ass-colts; above all, I am faithful, so that nothing in the world can part us but the sexton’s spade and shovel; and if your Highness does not choose to give me the government you promised, God made me without it, and perhaps it may be all the better for my conscience if I do not get it; for fool as I am, I understand the proverb, ‘The pismire had wings to her sorrow’; and perhaps it may be easier for Sancho the squire to get to heaven than for Sancho the governor.’... ‘And let me tell you again that, if your Highness will not give me the island because I am a fool, I will be wise enough not to care a fig for it.’...

‘My good Sancho knows full well,’ said the Duchess, ‘that the promise of a knight is held so sacred by him, that he will perform it even at the expense of life. The Duke, my lord and husband, though he is not of the errant order, is nevertheless a knight, and therefore will infallibly keep his word as to the promised government. Let Sancho, then, be of good cheer; for inspite of the envy and malice of the world, before he is aware of it, he may find himself seated in the state chair of his island and territory, and in full possession of a government for which he would refuse one of brocade three stories high. What I charge him is to take heed how he governs his vassals, and forget not that they are well born, and of approved loyalty.’ ‘As to the matter of governing,’ answered Sancho, ‘let me alone for that. I am naturally charitable and good to the poor, and

'None shall dare the leaf to steal from him that sifts and kneads the meal'; by my heads! they shall put no false dice upon me. An old dog is not to be coaxed with a crust, and I know how to snuff my eyes and keep the cobwebs from them; for I can tell where the shoe pinches. All this I say to assure your Highness that the good shall have me hand and heart, while the bad shall find neither the one nor t' other. And, as to governing well, the main point, in my mind, is to make a good beginning; and, that being done, who knows but that by the time I have been fifteen days a governor, my fingers may get so nimble in the office that they will tickle it off better than the drudgery I was bred to in the field.' 'You are right, Sancho', quoth the Duchess, 'for everything wants time: men are not scholars at their birth, and bishops are made of men, not of stones.'.....

Asses That Went To Governments

Sancho again kissed the Duchess's hand, and begged of her, as a favour, that good care might be taken of his Dapple, for he was the light of his eyes. 'What mean you by Dapple?' quoth the Duchess. 'I mean my ass, please your Highness,' replied Sancho; 'for not to give him that name, I commonly call him Dapple.....'..... 'Carry him, Sancho,' quoth the Duchess, 'to your government, and there you may regale him as you please, and set him free from further labour.' 'Think not, my Lady Duchess' quoth Sancho, 'that you have said much; for I have seen more asses than one go to governments, and therefore, if I should carry mine, it would be nothing new'.....

(DON QUIXOTE by Cervantes)*

The Glory of Government

"Mr. Jinnah and the League had striven for a United India, but the experience of Congress rule in 1937-39 opened their eyes; they then saw that their salvation did not lie in a United India but in a Muslim India separate from a Hindu India....

The idea of Pakistan was not conceived solely as a solution of the perennially recurring Muslim minority problem, but the inspiration and the motivating force behind it is the burning consciousness and the irrepressible desire that the Muslim nation shall see its genius and its soul reflected in the glory of government, and all those institutions of social happiness which are a part and parcel of the machinery of a durable and lasting government"—Malik Barkat Ali (a)

There are thus two motivating forces behind the Pakistan idea. The Muslims' grievances on the score of ill-treatment at the hands of the majority community governments in 1937-39 appear to be not incapable of being redressed. Would they be satisfied with such removal? The reply would seem to be in the negative. They have declared they will not have a constitution which has a central federal government where they fear the Hindus would be in a majority placing the Muslims in a perpetual position of a minority. Would they be satisfied if they had an *equal* voice with the Hindus on a central federal government? Mr. Jinnah would appear to have answered this question in the affirmative when at the close of his article in the *Time and Tide* dated the 19th January, 1940 (b) he demanded that "a constitution must be evolved that recognises that there are in India two nations *who both must share the governance of their common motherland.*" It is the purpose of this work to develop this theme and to put it before the country for consideration as a solution of our political problem.

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1941, Vol. II, page 233.

(b) "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION" by M. A. Jinnah, page 28.

For the last hundred years or so the Muslims have been labouring under the burden that they have been living in a country that has ceased to be a Dar-ul-Islam and a Dar-ul-Aman and has been a Dar-ul-Harb for the Faithful and that it has been and remains their duty as true Muslims either to improve the position and bring about a state of Dar-ul-Islam and Dar-ul-Aman, or to leave the country that has become a Dar-ul-Harb for them. Since the latter course has not been feasible for them, or at least has not been attempted except in the old Khilafat days when the question of Hijrat had been mooted, the Muslims have been concentrating on the first course with varying degree of intensity and with varying results. Although eminent Muslim Divines, e.g., Moulvi Keramat Ali Sahab of Jaunpur, have proved that for the Muslims India is a DAR-UL-ISLAM and not a DAR-UL-HARB, still it is a regrettable fact that in some parts of the country Muslims even today live under conditions which would be bound to create in them the belief that India is a DAR-UL-HARB for them; for instance, the Muslims in Bengal do not offer prayers in congregation, as has been enjoined, as a measure of safety, only in the case of Muslims living in a DAR-UL-HARB. They have also become conscious of the natural urge and the irrepressible desire to set up one or more states of their own. And this first course can only be brought about if and when Muslims become masters in their own house: if they have a separate house of their own: or if they have a house in joint partnership with another party where each is owner of the house equally with the other.

Mr. A. C. Balasundara Nayakar suggests (a) the constitution of four STANS, (1) East Muslimstan, (2) West Muslimstan, (3) Hindustan, (4) Dravidastan. He admits that the division might induce the Muslimstans to incline towards the adjoining Muslim States of Persia and Afghanistan. He envisages the possibility of friction between Muslimstans and Hindustan, and he says this would be prevented so long as India remained under the banner of England (b). And Mr. Nayakar goes on to say that "even after that the people of Hindustan could resist any such invasion (by Muslimstans) with the help of the people of Dravidastan." (c).

Such eventualities are inevitable concomitants of small entities as has been demonstrated in history time and again. The remedy would appear to lie in evolving a United India, a strong Union within the British Empire with all the freedom and independence enjoyed by the Dominions with the right of secession at will. Such a Union could have in time its own armed forces able to withstand aggression from any quarter. Such a Union is envisaged by the advocates of STANS for Mr. Nayakar suggests "It would be for the greatest good of these four big federal states to have a common government for the whole of India for the purpose of defence of the whole country and its foreign relations and such other matters as may be necessary. These four states might form into a confederacy which might remain a dominion of Great Britain until it becomes so strong and skilful as to be able to protect its shores from foreign invasion of aggression without the help of the British forces and arms." (d)

To Reign is Worth Ambition

As regards the Muslims' desire to set up a house of their own, to have a separate Muslim State or States of their own, none can question their inherent natural right to entertain such a desire which has the strongest case by itself without the necessity of having to be tagged on to the "grievances" argument! Their numbers, their geographical situation, their culture, their genius, their

(a) Article entitled "Dravidian Regions should form a Separate State" in "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION" by Jinnah, page 96.

(b) " " " " " 97

(c) " " " " " 97

(d) " " " " " 97

virility and numerous other qualities born of a virile living religion pervading their whole life are factors which unquestionably proclaim their right to have a state of their own for themselves. If self-expression and self-determination have any meaning, they provide the strongest support to the Muslim claim for recognition of their homelands as separate national entities. If Pakistan may not promise to be a heaven with rivers flowing with milk and honey, it may not exactly prove to be a hell either. The love of Power, the desire to Rule, is but natural and human, even angelic,—for did not Lucifer, dissatisfied with heaven with his exalted position next only to God, declare

“ Here (in Hell) at least

We shall be free ; the Almighty hath not built

Here for his envy, will not drive us hence;

Here we may reign secure; and, in my choice,

To reign is worth ambition, though in Hell;

Better to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven” (a)

There are bound to be questions of expediency and adjustments which would require to be tackled, and which must, in the nature of things, take their time over their satisfactory settlement. But, as regards the *Principle* underlying the Muslim demand, it would seem there could be no room for any question whatever.

Typical Pakistanis

Sir Jogendra Singh has quoted (b) Guru Nanak's injunction that “when all other means fail, it is right to unsheath the sword.” The reference was hardly politic, it was hardly statesmanlike: threats, hints at coercion, can only succeed in inducing counter-threats: while threats and sabre-rattling by a minority would be mere bravado, emanating from a majority they would be bullyism: neither could make any contribution towards mutual understanding. On the other hand, the tribute paid by EL HAMZA to the (c) Hindus and Sikhs in Pakistan whom he fondly describes as ‘typical Pakistanis’ is certainly more helpful. Although EL HAMZA's object obviously was to woo these communities for support to Pakistan, the enlightened appreciation by the Punjab Muslims of the enlightened Hinduism practised by the Pakistani Hindus furnishes welcome evidence of the possibility of Muslims and Hindus, in suitable conditions and environments, being able to live together as equal partners in the great political, economic and social partnership which the United India of the future would constitute. If contact with the Islamic world has made the Pakistani Hindus acceptable to Muslims, may not similar contact produce similar welcome results elsewhere in this sub-continent?

Division of the country into regions united by bonds of race, religion and culture, such as, Aryan India, Dravidian India and Muhammadan India, would eliminate racial conflicts, religious bitterness and communal wranglings that have hitherto marred the tranquility of this fair land. The Partition might involve wholesale migration of populations, though the pro-separationists are not agreed as to the feasibility or even the necessity of such migration. Where minorities remained in situ, peace and concord would have to be aimed at and provided for. Whether the Partition would prove of advantage or disadvantage to the Muslims who demand it, whether Pakistan would be poor or rich, weak or strong, would be a matter for the Muslims alone to consider and decide for themselves. The concern of the minorities that would remain within Pakistan would only be to

(a) Milton, “PARADISE LOST”, Book I.

(b) *The Tribune*, Lahore, dated the 25th November, 1942.

(c) ‘PAKISTAN—A NATION,’ by El Hamza, pages 34-38.

ensure that "adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests" are specifically provided in the Pakistan constitution in consultation with them, as is pledged in the Muslim League's Pakistan Resolution of Lahore of March, 1940. The minorities might be tempted to demand that such safeguards should be *to their satisfaction*, and not framed merely in consultation with them. While it would be in the interests of the Muslims themselves that they should ensure that the safeguards provided for the minorities in Pakistan are fully satisfactory to those minorities, it would hardly be fair to the Muslims that the minorities should be placed in a position to utilise the question of their satisfaction to obstruct the creation of Pakistan. After all, this would be purely a matter of give and take by mutual agreement, not of imposing one party's will over another: and no room should be allowed for interested third parties to have a say therein.

The Ultimate End—The Last Resort

While the proposed Partition may be accepted as the ultimate end to be resorted to as the last resort, efforts may usefully be made to seek a solution, even if a patchwork one, which may help in making the transitional stage as easy and free from hardship and bitterness of feelings as may be possible. The suggestions in this work have been framed with this end in view. They seek to cover an initial period of 20 years, but if found practicable and helpful in achieving inter-communal harmony as the author hopes they will, their operation could be extended over successive periods of 20 years till in the fullness of time the elements now in conflict will find themselves so used to harmony, with the causes of friction so blunted as to be imperceptible, when the rising generations of today and tomorrow may find the maladiies of today but an unhappy memory of the past, when they may find themselves unable to understand the sharply dividing differences of today.

LET US THEN ACCEPT PAKISTAN—IN PRINCIPLE: LET US ACCEPT IT HERE AND NOW

It is possible, however, that the Muslims may not want to set up a separate house of their own at once: they may not be of one mind on the point: *they may want time to consider their position with cool judgment* which the thick of the controversy that has been raging ceaselessly does not permit: they may be prepared to wait for a time if their right to separate is accepted in principle. In fact, this appears to be just the League's position—that if the principle were conceded, it would be prepared to leave its implementation to the decision of a referendum after the termination of the war—a reasonable position: many in this country see its reasonableness today: many more will see it tomorrow. The country's interests demand that the reasonableness of this position should be admitted and conceded.

The British Government are obviously in no hurry to part with power. The League will not agree to the transference of power to a Central Government where the Muslims would be in a minority. The result is that all must wait till the end of the war. It would appear to be clear that the British Government will not be prepared to make any move whatever until after the war is over, and that all efforts of Leaders and Bodies in this country that are now being made or which may be made hereafter to secure an immediate advance towards the country's goal are bound to prove futile. We must recognise that we have 'missed the bus!'

It would also appear to be clear that the Muslim claim is not going to receive support from the British Government. The Muslims will have to secure the willing agreement of the Hindus in their plan of separation. Will this be forthcoming? It remains with the Muslims to create the necessary atmosphere of accommodation and goodwill.

Neither will the British Government, on the other hand, coerce the Muslims to accept a constitution where they would be a perpetual minority.

The British Government will thus always be in the right in their attitude of aloofness, leaving the Hindus and the Muslims to evolve an agreement between themselves—an agreement which the British Government could safely expect would be almost a human impossibility to evolve.

Honest Sancho would have said "If your Highness will not give me the island because I am a fool, I will be wise enough not to care a fig for it."

It remains with the Hindus to place the Muslims in a position to be able to echo Sancho's reply. Let both share the governance of the country as equal partners. Let the Hindus so alter conditions in India, both social and political, as would induce the Muslims to continue to stay on in their present household amongst their present neighbours and surroundings—all so altered as would induce the Muslims to stay on for 20 years, 30 years, for a generation, another generation, and another.....

As El Hamza wisely advises, (a)

"Let all Indian peoples be just to each other and India will have peace and will make great progress. If some of them (or the leaders of some of them) try to cheat some others, then India will be weak and miserable and backward. Whatever we make of India—a confederation or an entente or a United States or separate nation-states—let us do it in as just a manner as possible. Hindus or Muslims, Aryans or Dravidians, high caste or low caste—whatever group-name we go by, let us, first and last, be just to each other."

I would humbly add

"MAY THE LORD GRANT US COOL JUDGMENT—MAY HE
GRANT US SOUND JUDGMENT."

PART—V
THE INDIA CHARTER

THE GOLDEN MEAN

SURA XXXI—LUQMAN (THE WISE)

19. "AND BE MODERATE

IN THY PACE, AND LOWER

THY VOICE; FOR THE HARSHTEST

OF SOUNDS WITHOUT DOUBT

IS THE BRAYING OF THE ASS."

سُورَةُ لُقْمَانَ

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

وَأَقِمْ وَفِىْ مَشِيْكَ وَأَعْظُفْ مِنْ

صَوْتِكَ ؕ إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ كَذِرٌ

إِلَّا صَوَاتِ لُحُوفِ الْحَيَاطَةِ

Note—3604—"The 'GOLDEN MEAN' is the pivot of the philosophy of Luqman as it is of the philosophy of Aristotle and indeed of Islam. And it flows naturally from a true understanding of our relations to God and His Universe and to our fellow-creatures, especially man. In all things be moderate. Do not go the pace, and do not be stationary or slow. Do not be talkative and do not be silent. Do not be loud and do not be timid or half-hearted. Do not be too confident, and do not be cowed down. If you have patience, it is to give you constancy and determination, that you may bravely carry on the struggle of life. If you have humility, it is to save you from unseemly swagger, not to curb your right spirit and your reasoned determination." (a)

Thus the Holy Book provides guidance for the Faithful in the clearest terms—guidance which applies today equally in the political field as it does in all walks of life, in all life's manifold activities. "Be moderate in thy pace": in the commentator's words, "Do not be stationary or slow, but at the same time do not go the pace: Do not be cowed down, but at the same time do not be too confident: have patience, so that you may have constancy and determination, bravely to carry on the struggle of life: so "WALK IN THE GOLDEN MEAN."

WE HAVE BEEN WARNED

Pakistan—A Circle of Stagnation!

"...a bare possibility may theoretically be admitted that overwhelming force can partition India as any other country for a while, but only for a while. It is not given to man to pull a geographical, cultural and economical whole to pieces and to rearrange the parts at will with any durable prospects. The tempo of separation would have its own repercussions on the Indian states; it would disintegrate Pakistan itself. The throw-back to the 18th or 11th century would soon bring a reaction and give the age-long centripetal forces a chance again. Partition will not stay put. A confederation of India as a whole with the British Commonwealth or with the Middle East or with the whole world may some day become a practical proposition. But a durable partition of India is not less difficult than a redistribution of the Himalayan ranges, the abolition of history, the destruction of patriotism as such, or the obliteration of the genius of the modern age. Even as a stop gap, it points logically to perpetual antagonism, requiring the perpetual presence of an overwhelming British force and, therefore, British control of foreign policy, economic life, in fact, of all the major departments of government. Partition is a circle of stagnation. The idea was forced into emergence by thirteen years of stagnation. If realised, it would spell stagnation. Yet stagnation is the one thing that civilisation cannot endure for long; the dynamic quality of civilisation asserts itself and movement commences again.

Partition offers no solution of the Indian problem. Paradoxical as it may seem, it is a psychological escape from the stern realities of the situation. It is a gesture of a century of revivalism, a generation of separate electorates, half a generation of procrastination, a decade of misleading and misunderstood foreign influences, and two and a half years of orthodox parliamentarism. It is a milestone on the separatist road to security. It is a confession of the failure of separate electorate as tried so far. In the logical sequence, it is only a half-way house; if persisted in, it cannot escape the corollaries of exchange of populations and finally a drive towards the complete domination either of the Hindus by the Mussalmans or of the Mussalmans by the Hindus. That is an utter impossibility and the end of the blind alley. These implications are not mere abstractions; they inhere in the idea and could be overlooked only in the abnormal mists of the Indian situation. As the sky clears and the implications of partition are perceived, the good sense of both the communities as well as the pressure of events is likely to give a new direction to politics. But so long as the idea endures, whether as a bargaining counter or a serious proposition, the danger of it is in the estrangement that it may create. Every political idea evokes an appropriate technique of propaganda and often a corresponding mutation in a whole programme. The idea of separation propagates itself naturally by seizing on existing differences and magnifying them into fundamentals. It grates on the patriotic sentiments of millions and drives the iron into the soul. All this weakens the will to agreement. That indeed is the most alarming difference between the present situation and that in 1916 or even in 1930. There is another risk in using separationist pleas as political feelers or levers. They may inflame the imagination of an extensive and immature public and make retreat awkward. That the idea should

have been adopted even temporarily by a great political organisation cannot but disturb the complacency of the others. To the Hindus it is an excruciating warning to turn the searchlight inwards and eradicate those attitudes which prevent others from feeling completely secure with them. Above all, it implies an obligation to find such a comprehensive remedy for the distempers of the body politic as may bring a sense of peace and freedom to all." (a)

What is Independence ?

(The following extract has been taken from Mr. H. N. Brailsford's
"SUBJECT INDIA," pages 110-119).

"Twelve years ago, for the first time, Congress startled other Indians by a plain demand for 'independence.' Its use of the word was at that time tactical: in fact, Gandhi would have been satisfied with the status of a Dominion. If he could have got it then without equivocation and delay, he would have accepted the unavoidable transitional arrangements. Before this date, Mr. Gokhale had looked forward to 'colonial self-government' in a somewhat distant future, while Mr. Tilak towards the end of his life flung himself into an agitation for immediate 'Home Rule.' Congress before 1930 had been content to use the vague but expressive term 'swaraj' (self-rule). Today, when it says 'independence' it means it, in the fullest juridical sense of the word. Not the least significant fact in the situation that now confronts us is that the other Indian parties, including the Muslim League, have had to come into line with it.

What, then, do Indians mean by 'independence?' I put this question recently to a very able Indian friend. He paused for a moment and then replied: 'I mean a state of things in which the British Government can no longer play off Muslims against Hindus and the princes against both.' This is, I believe, what Indians chiefly mean by the word, though it may not be all they mean. If India were a Dominion, with the status laid down in the Statute of Westminster, and her right of secession expressly recognised, this definition would be satisfied. The tactics of division could no more be used against her than they can be used—where it would be equally easy to use them—against Canada or South Africa. That they can be used during her difficult passage to the status of a Dominion is, however, only too obvious. Thereafter the subtler risks that might infringe the reality of her independence would be of another order—the risks which lie in wait for every National State that has to depend on others for financial or military aid. If political conditions, expressed or implied, are attached to the grant of this assistance, to that extent its independence is infringed and may become a far from splendid illusion. But for the time being the attention of Indians is chiefly focussed on an objective more easily attainable. They want to shape their own future without our interference, be it interested or benevolent.

The Dominion pattern would satisfy this ambition. But neither the name nor the thing has any magic for Indians. We had talked about it through so many years of an always restless and unhappy relationship and relegated it so often to a distant and undated future, that few Indians could hear the word without irritation. The idea has for us associations that mean nothing to them. For us the Dominions are countries peopled by our kinsmen. There our own family names occur: the arrival of letters that link sundered brothers is an event to which we look forward,

and so are the pilgrimages which cousins, born overseas, make to what is still for them 'the home country.' The political relationship, vaguely defined, with no organised institutional structure, befits the informal dealings of kinsmen. This tie, unlike anything else in history or the contemporary world, works best when the Dominion is solidly Anglo-Saxon, as New Zealand is, and very ill when it is alien in blood, as Eire is. What can this model mean to Indians—a people foreign to us in blood, speech and culture, whose memories are not of any cradle in this island, but of the great days when Asoka ruled with mercy and Akbar with tolerance? The mother and daughters analogy is ludicrously inappropriate here. Nor is there here the basis of casual, easy-going confidence that enables us to carry the Dominions with us in our external policy through the simple process of exchanging cablegrams and talking with their Agents in London. All told, their white populations number little more than half our own. India, if she achieves her unity and prospers in liberty, will one day be conscious of a place in the family of mankind rather higher than we commonly assign to her. If ever these four hundred millions, literate, awakened, well-nourished and well-housed, attain self-respect with freedom, India will rank high among the Great Powers. Would the Dominion idea fit a member of that stature? Finally, let us realise that no tie of sentiment will ever link India with the other Dominions. Their empty spaces are not for her crowded millions. All of them have in one form or another erected against her emigrants the insult of a colour-bar.

It is, then, probable, if our future relationship with India is determined by any method resembling that of the Cripps offer, that she will avail herself, promptly or at an early date, of the *right to secede* from the British Commonwealth. I am making throughout this chapter the speculative assumption that in spite of Mr. Churchill's Mansion House Speech, we would let her go. Sentiment will carry her powerfully in that direction. On the other hand, it is hard to see what Indians can have to gain by insisting, as Gandhi would now do, that their independence should be recognised in legal form at once. Would much or anything be gained in time; if the intermediate stage, during which India ranked as a Dominion, were omitted? Probably not. During the war, while British and Allied troops operate on Indian soil under a British Commander-in-Chief, the word 'independent' might be used as a matter of courtesy, and changes might be rapidly made in ceremonial matters: but would this be 'independence' as the word is commonly understood? Innumerable questions of detail, some of them of considerable importance, would have to be settled by negotiation before the separation could be completed—matters connected with the currency, the Reserve Bank, the debt, the rights of Civil Servants, the status of British residents and companies in India, and much else to which it would be folly to devote time and attention, while the war had still to be won. Again, in the military sense, India, however frankly we might be willing to concede her political independence, could not stand alone, either during the war or for some time after it, and a treaty of alliance would have to be negotiated with the United Nations. In their councils India would possess the weight to which her realisable resources, human and industrial, entitled her. Provided that she had a National Government which possessed the confidence of her people, it would make little difference whether it was in legal form the Viceroy's Executive Council, the responsible Cabinet of a Dominion or the central authority of an independent Indian Commonwealth. In any event, whatever her legal standing, India cannot consolidate her eventual federal structure until after the advent of peace, and even then, the process cannot

be rapid. This is at all times a realistic world, but especially it is so amid total war. India will be as independent as the right hands of her armed men. her steel-mills and her engineering shops make her. Parchments and proclamations cannot confer independence, they can only describe what muscle and steel have won.

For the rest Indians would be wise to recognise that the method laid down in the Cripps offer, the road to independence through Dominion Status and, if they choose it, secession is for them and for us the smoothest and not the longest. I can not argue that our conduct towards them has in the past been so considerate that we have a right to ask from them some respect for our pride as a great Empire. We must in any event face a surrender of power which is for the old-fashioned Imperialist difficult and repugnant. Happily that old-world possessive attitude towards empire has grown steadily less confident and sure of itself since the early years of this century. But there are ways of surrendering power which fit our habits of thought and involve no sense of humiliation or defeat. The road through Dominion Status has this merit. Rightly or wrongly, the kind of surrender which Gandhi demanded, even if in details he consented to compromise, would affront all that is worst and much that is best in our instinctive, and traditional attitude to life. If Indians reject the smooth and easy road, they will not win independence more quickly, and they may bring on themselves and on us a tragic and ruinous struggle, from which all that is sane and constructive in both our nations recoils in horror. Nothing in the logic of history requires it.

It would be wise and generous on our part, none the less, as an earlier page has argued, to use the word 'independence' without hesitation. Let our solution be, when we revise the Cripps formula, an offer of independence, which Indians shall enjoy, at their free choice, within the British Commonwealth or outside it. But when this is said, Indians must join us in facing the fact that by two parallel lines of development the old-world concept of national sovereignty and independence has been profoundly modified in our generation, first by technical changes and then by the reaction to them of our social thinking. Never again will the gallantry of a little nationality find in its dykes or mountains defensible ramparts for its independence. An industrially backward country, even if its man-power enables it to mobilise greater armies than the aggressor can put into the field, may have to abandon for a period of years, as China has had to do, immense and fertile territories, counting itself fortunate that vast distances and poor communications enable it to prolong its resistance in the far interior. Its hopes of recovering what it has lost depend on the precarious help it receives from wealthier Powers which can manufacture the arguments of justice. In these days, when the Panzer Divisions of one Great Power can range at will over Europe, while a thousand bombers scatter ruin in a single night over her cities, how many nations are effectively independent? Mechanised warfare, but more especially air-power, have shattered the old-world concept of sovereignty. Independence has become what mathematicians would call a function of heavy industry.

In reaction against this brutal fact, how far and how fast will social morality carry us towards an international organisation built on law, democracy and mutual aid? That is a secret of the unknown future. The phrases of the Atlantic Charter are deliberately vague, and General Smuts, who doubtless reflects the main trend of Anglo-American policy, has warned us that such international organisation as may come into existence will be less ambitious than the Geneva League. Charters and Covenants

councils and assemblies, formal definitions of rights and obligations, are out of fashion. The prevalent conception of the future if I grasp it correctly, is that the lesser states will accept the leadership of the two Powers which possess an overwhelming superiority of military and industrial might, and these in turn will admit their smaller neighbours to informal and friendly consultation. The model for the world, as Mr. Herbert Morrison has told us, will be the British Commonwealth. Regional Councils, a Pacific Council, for instance, may continue to discuss the common affairs of the United Nations, but in the last resort the decision to set in motion the fleets, naval and aerial, of Britain and America, or to make available their manufacturing resources for the assistance of others will lie with the governments of Washington and London, and not with any international authority. In other words, the creation of an organically international police force subject to an international government lies in the distant future. In a degree difficult to foresee, the nature and amount of the assistance, military and economic, on which lesser Powers can rely will depend on their willingness to conform to British and American policy. How much, for instance, will they receive if their economic tendencies are radical enough to incur the disfavour of Wall Street and the City? The picture is complicated by the existence of a mighty third focus of military power in Moscow, which enjoys less intimate relations with the other two. How long will it be possible to deny to Germany and Japan any place in this pattern of power? There is not in this dim vision of the post-war world much scope for independence as it has hitherto been conceived. As a social and ethical idea many of us have outgrown it and will see it vanish without regret. This view of the future may for the moment flatter British and American patriotism. But to accept dependence without a federal structure and without representative institutions will not indefinitely satisfy the rest of mankind. It is already possible to foresee some of the ways in which nations of the second and third rank, facing the colossal bulk of the three surviving armed Great Powers, will endeavour to counter-balance their hegemony. They will try by regional grouping and costly armaments to alter the Balance of Power. Some will form a confederacy with their neighbours, as the Czechs and Poles and also the Greeks and South Slavs propose to do. Any group of States, like the first of these two pairs, that has the natural resources on which heavy industry and the manufacture of machine tools can be based, will endeavour at any cost to develop these sources of power. Not all of them are in this fortunate case—the second pair is not. It is a restless and unstable prospect and across it there may sweep revolutionary tides which as yet we cannot measure.

It is against this background that the problems of India's Independence have to be envisaged. Her numbers promise her what her poverty denies—the stature of a Great Power. She has in abundance and high quality the iron which heavy industry requires, but she is still far from being able to supply herself unaided with the more elaborate weapons of mechanised warfare. It is to be expected that as soon as she governs herself, she will for economic as well as military reasons develop her heavy and machine-tool industries. She will also hasten to give her army its due complement of field and staff officers. Will she, for the sake of safety, during these early years content herself with the status of a Dominion, so that she may enjoy the protection of the British Commonwealth—a guarantee not quite as absolute as it looked before this war? Or will she gamble on the chance that no major war is likely to surprise the world for a decade at least? In that case, will she promptly exercise her right of secession?

It would be rash to venture on a confident prediction. The ties formed by soldiers, lawyers, engineers and traders through two centuries may hold for a time, even if the sentimental bond is weak, and there are conservative Indians who may hesitate to break altogether with the past. But we may have to adjust ourselves to the prospect of a legal separation, which need not be an obstacle to friendly and helpful relations. There are tendencies which may carry India out of the British Commonwealth and into association with her Asiatic neighbours. They cannot be traced to her past history. This peninsula, until Europeans began to trade with it from armed ships and fortified 'factories', lived a life of relative isolation. From it Buddhist missionaries had carried its ideas over the Himalayas and across the seas. Muslim invaders had often penetrated it. But the rules of caste forbade Hindus to cross the dark ocean, nor did the Moghul Empire aspire to play a part beyond its natural boundaries. In our own day Muslims have been conscious of their links with other peoples of their own faith, more especially in the years immediately after the first World War. But even in the East religious sympathy is a diminishing force in international politics. The Turks have secularised their Republic. Arabs, scattered over the immense belt of territory from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, may, over part of it at least, discover a principle that will unite them, but it will be rather their racial or nationalistic affinity than their common religion. Islam, in short, is today rather a powerful cultural link than a spring of political action. But in our generation there has grown up in the vast area that lies between Bombay and Tokio a new sense of the fraternity of the Asiatic peoples. The Japanese, with what success it is difficult to estimate, have sought to promote it and exploit it. Its negative meaning is readily grasped: it is a reaction of the self-respect and the instinct of self-preservation of the Asiatic peoples against Western Imperialism and the white man's colour bar. Tagore made Chinese scholars welcome in his college at Santiniketan and Gandhi would share his devotions with Japanese pilgrims in his monastery. Above all, during China's struggle for survival, the sympathy between the two great Asiatic peoples has grown into an active political force. Something wholly new in the history of Asia began to happen when Pandit Nehru shared the life of Chungking under a Japanese bombardment and Marshal Chiang Kai-shek visited Delhi. The paradox of this fraternisation is that it is our planes and our language which have made it easy. As yet it could supply a motive for action only to the more imaginative among the intellectuals of the two peoples, but such sentiments tend to spread downwards. Looking into the future Pandit Nehru has more than once made the forecast that a free India will find her closer ties rather with her Asiatic neighbours than with the peoples of the British Commonwealth. He has even suggested that an Asiatic League may one day be formed with India and China as its leading members.

This is an interesting and may be a prophetic suggestion. A sentiment of fraternity would not suffice to bring such a League into being. The realities of economics and 'geopolitics' have also to be considered. In the economic sense India and China are not complementary. Both are chiefly backward primary producers. They do not need and cannot greatly help each other. All these Asiatic countries are still dependent on imported capital goods—that is to say on machinery, which they must draw in the future chiefly from Great Britain, the United States and possibly from Germany. The leading banks and shipping firms which dominate commerce are still mainly European, American or Japanese. If Japan fails by conquest to unify this vast region as her 'Co-prosperity Sphere,' is she

capable of the political and moral evolution which would enable her to play a useful and acceptable part within it as the seafaring and industrial Power possessed of the most advanced technique and the greatest aptitude for organisation? Or have her militarists ruined her chances of peaceful leadership by their ruthlessness as the Nazis may have ruined the prospects of Germany? Again, it is hard to foresee the economic changes that may follow the war. The Filipinos, for example, have been urged to grow for Japan the raw cotton which Indians used to export. Will natural rubber and oil be again the coveted raw materials they were in the past? Could Indian heavy industries, stimulated for the second time by war, expand so far in the first decade of peace that they might begin to supply the needs of other Asiatic peoples? The immediate foreground of the future is even more obscure than the European scene, for we do not even know how much longer Japan and the Soviet Union will remain at peace with one another.

The long-range tendencies may be easier to forecast. The old imperial regimes that were overthrown so easily in Malaya, Burma and the Dutch islands cannot be restored precisely as they were, though it may cost us some time and trouble to reach this conclusion. American interest in this part of the world has been greatly stimulated. America will not imitate any of the older forms of imperialism and will be impatient of such vestiges of it as we try to retain. She proposes, if Vice-President Wallace and his school have their way, to help the agricultural peoples, especially India and China, to enter the industrial age—or in plain words to supply them with machinery on long-term credit, or even on lend-lease terms. Like every relationship of dependence between unequal partners this plan of development may have its dangers, but it is incomparably less dangerous than the imperialist techniques of the past. So far from seeing in these Asiatic countries estates whose sole function was to furnish Western industry with raw materials and foods, it would emancipate them from this colonial status. Nor is it proposed that Western capital shall directly exploit Eastern labour by itself constructing and operating its own railways, steel-mills and factories under some form of privilege. The very grave risk that the borrowing Power may lose something of its political liberty in this way would be lessened, if the transactions were carried out or controlled by an international organisation. The alternative open to India and China is that they should imitate the heroic self-reliance of Russia, refrain from borrowing and build up their capital equipment rather more slowly by stinting their own consumption. The risk that India or China might run is not from the older and more brutal type of intervention. It is rather that Washington or London may make their aid dependent on the adoption or avoidance of some measure in social policy, or on the admission to power of some 'safe' party or leader or the exclusion from it of another. It may be conveyed to the Asiatic client State by discreet channels that it need expect no economic help, if it should 'liquidate' its landlords, or socialise its coal mines, or if it should allow a Socialist leader to form a Ministry, or again, if it hesitates to suppress its Communists; or else it may be required to cut down some item in its social services, of course for the sake of solvency. Pressure of this kind has been applied in the fairly recent past even to Great European Powers. A poor nation cannot escape it merely proclaiming its sovereign independence. Assuredly if India and China stand shoulder to shoulder and manage to group some of their weaker neighbours round them; their liberties, political and economic, are the less likely to be infringed by the great capitalist Powers of the West. How far they could manage without external help to

ensure their own military safety, it is not easy to foresee. That depends partly on the political changes which may take place in Japan as the result of the defeat which all these speculations assume. There and elsewhere in this region Communism may take root and thrive. The other difficult factor to estimate is technical: is air power now so far superior to naval power at least in narrow waters and within a fighter's range from its base on shore, that India and China could hope for a fair measure of security, if they possessed a good air force but lacked the means to build a great fleet. As the reader will perceive, in this effort to foresee the future framework within which India will have to shape her own destinies, I am trying to anticipate what is probable rather than what is desirable. It will be a hard world, seared by long familiarity with cruelty and suffering. Its climate will not favour idealism. We do not yet know how completely restrictive monopoly capitalism will dominate it, or for how long. This time it will not even talk about disarmament, save that it will disarm the aggressor of yesterday. To steer an independent course in such a world will demand from Indian statesmen unusual and sagacious courage, and their success will depend mainly on their ability to solve social and economic problems of desperate difficulty within their internal structure. In spite of the dangers, I think that India will at an early moment after the peace choose complete independence, and I hope she will ally herself with a victorious China. It is to be foreseen that any government we are likely to have at Westminster will try to block her road by using the princes. But the device cannot be used for ever.

In a rational and kindly world independence would not be incompatible with mutual aid. At the end of this war, in all the belligerent countries, millions of workers, who had learned to face the enemy's bombers with stout hearts, will stare with terror at the cold forges and clean chimneys of the mills which had employed them through the years of war. The apparatus which made the tools of destruction can with no ruinous cost or delay be adapted to make the tools of peace. The governments which have had in their hands the spending of half the nation's income dare not suddenly desist. They will have to organise and finance the rebuilding and restoration of all that has been destroyed between Severn and Volga. Need they stop there? In the East and above all in India, which has been our ward through two centuries, the hope of the future depends on the rapidity with which her backward and impoverished population can make the transition in field and workshop from an outmoded to a modern organisation of her super-abundant labour force. Much is needed which only she can effect, but much also is required which we could supply. She needs tools of every kind, both agricultural and industrial. She needs the machines that would enable her to make her first internal combustion engines, the equipment that would give her ample hydro-electric power, pumps that would spare her peasants the fantastic labour they spend in irrigating her fields—but the catalogue might be endless. In war, were it to Africa or Asia, we sent all the tools our armies demanded without counting the cost. To lift these Asiatic peoples and above all the Indians who were our subjects to a level of life more worthy of humanity, would it be amiss to send out the tools that would do it on easy terms of credit, and at cost price? For my part I would dare to propose a free gift of machinery equal in value to a week's cost of the war, or let us say £100,000,000. If it is proper to send out a machinegun for which we shall never be repaid, would it be amiss to give an irrigation pump? It would cost us only the difference between the wages of the British workers who made it and the dole they would otherwise

receive in idleness and discontent. The higher level of productivity and comfort it brought to India would soon be reflected in a rising volume of normal trade between her shores and ours. The terms on which this might be done could be worked out between Whitehall and Delhi in such a way as to arouse no suspicion of any infringement of India's independence. It would be at once a sane and remunerative stroke of economic policy and an imaginative act of statesmanship. If India decides to quit us, then let us give her a dowry worthy of our pride.

If the reader still doubts whether it would be expedient to further the prosperity of an independent India by a splendid gift conceived on a grand scale, may I ask him a question? On a rough estimate, how many hundreds or thousands of millions would it be worth to us during a generation, in goodwill and in a lower level of armament, if across the Atlantic, in Russia and in Asia men ceased to use the two words 'British Imperialism?' We would, if we dared to act greatly, so treat India that men would be ashamed to utter them."

I—INTRODUCTORY

We have seen in the foregoing pages that there are differences between the major communities, the Hindus and the Muslims, in religious, social, economic and political spheres. Besides these, there are also internal sectional differences both among the Muslims and among the Hindus. These differences have been responsible for inter-sectional and inter-communal discord and consequent disunity. We have also noticed there is misunderstanding between the Rulers and the peoples of the Indian States, and between them and the Peoples of British India.

Our British Rulers have taken up the stand that until and unless the various interests in British and Indian India achieve a sufficient measure of unity and put forward a joint demand, there can be no political advance. If political advance is to be achieved, an agreed plan must be evolved which must secure general support of all interests. Such an achievement has hitherto proved an impossible task, and if the past and the present are guide to the future, the trends one discerns hardly hold a hopeful prospect.

The situation was summed up in his farewell address to a joint sessions of the Central Legislature on the 1st August, 1943 by the retiring Viceroy, H. E. Lord Linlithgow, wherein he is reported to have observed :—

Not one Practical or Constructive Solution

“...that the fact that there should have been no greater progress was not due to lack of efforts, enthusiasm or goodwill on the part of His Majesty's Government and the Viceroy. From the beginning of the war he had done everything any man could do to bring parties, interests and communities together. Even today these internal divisions, those communal rivalries, that reluctance to place India first and subordinate ambitions, jealousies and communal interests to the common interest of the country, stood in the way of progress. That division and lack of harmony, and not the reluctance of His Majesty's Government to transfer power to Indian hands, stood in the way. During all these times, not a single formula had been put forward by any Indian party. The whole burden of giving constructive proposals in relation either to interim or final solution had been left to the British Government or the Viceroy. They, on their part, were most anxious to give all assistance in their power and give one proposal after another, trying to harmonise conflicting claims of parties, interests and communities. Yet one endeavour after another of His Majesty's Government for a solution acceptable to India as a whole had been rejected by one party or another. Not one practical or constructive alternative had been put forward in this country.

It was India herself, if India wanted to govern herself, that might find a solution for her problems. His Majesty's Government and the Viceroy 'continue to try to help' as they had tried in the past, but the burden lay on India, on her leaders, on the principal elements in her national life. It was the discord between those principal elements of the national life, the lack of adjustment of the legitimate claims of the minorities, of parties and of interests that stood in the way. Those obstacles India could by herself remove.

The British Government, as in the past, hoped that on the conclusion of the war Indian leaders might sit at the table to hammer out their own country's own constitution. The whole field was open to them. If the proposals which His Majesty's Government had made at one time or another were unacceptable to India as a whole, there was nothing to stop India's leaders from putting forth constructive proposals and devising alternatives of whatever nature, trying to negotiate with other parties in this country to secure support for the alternative.

Whatever alternative and whatever scheme was devised it must take account of practical considerations. It must have the general support of important elements of India's national life. No scheme, however good, it might appear on paper, would be workable without the support of the principal elements or would have any hope of surviving for long. A National Government could be a reality if it was generally representative, if it had the general support of major parties and the people as a whole." (a)

The Agreed Plan

It is the aim of this work to provide such a Plan—an **AGREED PLAN**—a plan that may receive the general support of the principal elements of India's national life. The suggestions made in the following pages aim at providing the groundwork of such an Agreed Plan.

It will be observed that the Plan comprises two Formulas—the Communal Formula and the Political Formula.

Communal Formula—Equality

The former embodies the solutions I have suggested for the several 'Communal Differences' discussed in an earlier chapter. The Formula is presented in the form of a **TREATY**, an Agreement between Equals, registering, for all time, the friendly and neighbourly arrangements assured by mutual give and take, guaranteeing Perpetual Peace and Concord between the Muslims and the Hindus all over the world.

Political Formula—Freedom the Goal—Unity the Path

The latter, the Political Formula, presents certain arrangements framed with **FREEDOM** as the Goal, and **UNITY** as the Path leading up to it—Unity inter-sectional as between Caste and non-Caste Hindus, Unity inter-communal as between Muslims and Hindus, Unity uniting British and Indian India. As will have been observed from the earlier Parts of this work, the factor that has been mainly responsible for the prevailing lack of Unity is the state of Inequality that now exists between the various interests: Harijans demand equality with Caste-Hindus, Muslims demand equality with Hindus, the Princes demand equality with British India in any scheme of federation. The Political Formula given in the following pages rests on Equality as the key-stone of the structure. It seeks to evolve a Free United India with Equality as the unifying bond holding all the interests together. In the Free United India that the Plan envisages, Princes and Commoners, Muslims and Hindus, the Ashrafs, Ajlafs and Arzals, the Harijans and the Twice-born, all would be Equals among themselves, with equal opportunities, equal rights and responsibilities. None would be in a position to dominate the others. Unity which has been impossible between Un-Equals would be assured between Equals. With Unity based on such broad and firm foundations, success should be assured to the Plan these pages place before the Country.

(a) The *Daily Gazette*, Karachi, dated 3rd August 1943.

Side by side with the question of the future political relations of our communities *inter se*, and the relations of these with the Princes and Peoples of Indian India, in the United India of Tomorrow, my Political Formula also deals with the future relations of United India with Britain. These naturally turn on the question of the political status of United India, that is, on the question whether it will be full-fledged Independence, or Dominion Status as enjoyed by the Dominions in the British Commonwealth.

This Freedom

As to the Freedom we have been talking of, different people have different conceptions of the term, while many have but the haziest notion of what it connotes. To some Dominion Status as enjoyed by the Dominions in the British Commonwealth would be the summum bonum, the summit of their ambition: to others anything less than absolute Independence would amount to a sacrilege, an unwarranted infraction of their birth-right. Competent observers have remarked that the one tangible result of the political drift of recent times has been the marked growth of the demand for Independence which now constitutes the declared goal of all the political parties in the Country. Whether this represents a deflection from the normal flow of political thought arising from the abnormal circumstances of abnormal times, or whether it reflects the normal course of natural developments, time alone will show. The Political Formula presented in these pages takes cognisance of the situation as now prevails in the Country: it assumes 'Independence' as the status of the United India it envisages, and offers suggestions for an Agreed Constitution for an Independent United India.

It will have been seen from these pages, particularly from Mr. Brailsford's views reproduced in this Part, that Independence would carry certain inevitable handicaps: and when the time arrives for our countrymen to take a decision, it is conceivable that for reasons of policy and expediency they may decide in favour of Dominion Status. On the principle that the greater includes the less, the suggestions offered in my Formula for Independent United India will be found to be not incompatible with the requirements of the Dominion of United India. At the same time, the Plan includes a Section expressly providing for this contingency. As the less holds the seed of the greater, Dominion Status, with its Secession provision, would hold Independence in embryo, and would permit of transition to Independence without any catastrophic upheavals.

Relations with Britain

The Plan includes proposals embodying the principles of a TREATY with Britain. These show what Free India would expect of Britain and what she in her turn would be prepared and willing to concede to her. Free India would like to build up the closest and the most friendly relations with Britain. She would like to build up trade relations with her to the mutual advantage and satisfaction of both. She would naturally want to build up her own strength in the military sense: and she would like that it should be Britain, rather than any other Power, who would help her to do so with all the armaments she would require as a nucleus. Of course, Free India would pay for all she received, and she would expect that she might not have to go past Britain for anything. She would during the initial stages be willing and anxious to take up British personnel along with the armaments she would take up from Britain, but she would have no British forces on her soil in the sense of a garrison which would be incompatible with the Free Status of a Free State. From the same apprehension, and with the case of Egypt in mind, she would not have any military alliance with Britain or any other Power until such time as she had built up her own military strength in an adequate measure. She would expect Britain to

appreciate her view-point, to fall in with it, and to assist her freely in a generous measure to the fullest extent of Free India's requirements. It would be in the interests of Britain's Empire that astride the wide expanses of the Indian Ocean there should be not only a friendly Free India, but also a *strong* Free India, protecting the Empire's far-flung arteries and guarding the flanks of her Dominions in Africa and Australia. Free India would expect Britain to help her to become a *strong* military Power with the utmost expedition, and for all the help she might get by way of armaments, warships, warplanes, etc., along with their trained personnel, she would *pay* Britain fully. She would expect Britain would do her part by her. But, at the same time, she would not allow the least infringement of her sovereign status either through the maintenance of a British garrison or through a military alliance which might operate to the detriment of her interests or be derogatory to her sovereign status. If it should happen that Britain were not prepared to co-operate with Free India on these lines, the Treaty provides that Free India would retain freedom of action and negotiate such arrangements with any other Power that might offer to co-operate with her on these lines.

Agreement on Preliminaries

It is not that we are called upon immediately to sit down at a round or square table and with the magician's wand produce from nothing a full-fledged 'Agreed Constitution.' What is required at the moment is that we should agree on the preliminaries, and the fundamental principles on which any constitution must be based. We should be able, for instance,

- (a) to agree on a Formula tending to compose our communal differences:
- (b) to agree to the mode of setting up a Constitution-Making Body, which might be fairly representative of all the interests concerned:
- (c) to agree on principles, such as the following, which might form the ground-work of the future Constitution:—
 - (i) that Pakistan shall be agreed to in principle:
 - (ii) that any scheme that may be evolved shall guarantee Equality in all matters between Muslims and Hindus and the other interests as above as a *sine qua non*:
 - (iii) that whether the Indian States shall join the future United India shall be a matter for them to decide:
 - (iv) that whether the future status of United India shall be absolute Independence, or Dominion Status, shall be left to be decided by the Country through its representatives after the new Constitution will have commenced to function.

The Tests—The Light and Seeing Eyes

My Formulas, Communal and Political, have been evolved with a view to enabling my countrymen to reach general agreement thereon between themselves—agreement which would tell the world what exactly my countrymen demand—a demand not of one or more parties or interests, but the common agreed demand of all parties and interests in the Country. Britain has asserted more than once that she would accept and implement any Plan that might be put forward with the general support of the principal elements of India's national life. My Plan is a test of my countrymen's sagacity and political capacity: if it succeeds in

securing general support, it will also be a test of the sincerity of Britain's assertions. The Plan does not suggest what shall be the next step forward then for my countrymen: if they will have achieved sufficient unity to put forward a generally supported demand, their newly-found unity will guide them in their further onward march. The light will have dawned: seeing eyes will be able to see their way forward.

For my part, I consider the Communal Settlement as embodied in my Communal Formula to be by far the more important of the two Formulas. The Muslims and the Hindus will be living together in the future as in the past, whether in United India, or in Pakistan and Hindustan, and it would be unthinkable that they should condemn themselves to a perpetual state of mutual distrust, disharmony and discord with all the resultant unending unhappiness! My Communal Formula aims at providing an effective and lasting solution of the Communal Differences. I commend it to my Muslim and Hindu countrymen, in all earnestness, for prayerful examination and adoption in their own interests—in the interests of the generations of Hindus and Muslims yet unborn. If they can reach an agreement on this Formula, it will have brought immediate Peace, Contentment and Happiness to our distracted millions—the purpose of this little book, praise God, will have been amply served.

Times and Climes and Charters of Liberty and Rights

Times and climes have had their Charters of Liberty and Rights that have profoundly affected the corporate life of humanity. It has cost humanity wars and revolutions to secure them, more to maintain them, more yet to deny them—to humanity. In our day, we are witnessing an armageddon professedly waged to revive human Liberty and Rights; we have witnessed the birth of a Charter, the Atlantic Charter: we have witnessed also its denial to a fifth of humanity.

• Charters do not create and confer Liberty and Rights on man: they only register what Liberty and Rights man secures for himself with his own prowess. What is human Liberty, what are human Rights, if they are subject to territorial limitations—if what are Liberty and Rights in the West mean Thralldom in the East? •

No agency outside ourselves can confer Freedom on us. Freedom is inherent in us: we would become Free the moment we realised and asserted our inherent strength—strength that spells Freedom, Freedom that spells strength. It is we ourselves that can confer Freedom on ourselves: we do not need an Atlantic or a Pacific Charter to confer Freedom on us. We want an India Charter, a Charter we can give ourselves, a Charter that is our own inner moral self revealed to our physical eye, a Charter that can help us to realise our inner innate strength which in other words we know as Freedom. The moment we recognise what prevents our realising the Freedom within us, the moment we adopt measures to overcome the obstruction and overcome it, that moment we shall be Free. The obstruction may be of our own creation or may have been imposed upon us: but its removal and the realisation of the Freedom within us would be a task we ourselves must face. The measures we evolve and adopt to achieve our purpose would collectively be our Charter—a Charter that Indians can give themselves to win their own Freedom. Inasmuch as these pages outline such measures as in my view are calculated to enable Indians to realise their Freedom through their own exertions, they may claim to constitute a Charter for India: my faith supports me to claim it to be the INDIA CHARTER that India wants: I confidently leave it to my countrymen to justify my claim to the title of this work.

2—EXPLANATORY

An Independent Federation

In the foregoing Parts we have seen that all Parties in the Country have set to themselves 'INDEPENDENCE' as their Goal: the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha want a Democratic Government on the principle of rule by majority: the Muslims and the Hindu Untouchables are opposed to it. The Muslims want Pakistan: the Hindus are opposed to it.

The INDIA CHARTER as outlined in the following pages comprises two Formulas: the Communal Formula and the Political Formula.

These Formulas do not constitute a Constitution, nor even the outline of one: they only put forward certain suggestions for acceptance as the 'principles' on which a Constitution could be framed. These 'principles' have been evolved after careful consideration of the view points of all the Parties, and of the circumstances now prevailing in the Country and those which may reasonably be expected to prevail in the immediate future. They seek to secure general support to these 'principles,' so that with such support, the 'principles' could provide a common platform on which general agreement could be attained between Communities and Parties, thereby dissolving what is known as our Political Deadlock, and facilitating the eventual framing of our future Constitution.

The Political Formula provides for the setting up of a Constitution-Making Body.

The Constitution of our Formula contemplates an Independent Federation.

It also provides that the question of decision as to the Country's future status, whether it shall be Independence in the fullest sense, or whether it shall be Dominion Status, shall rest with the people of the Primary Provinces and of such of the Muslim Provinces and the Indian State-Groups as shall have expressed their decision to join the Federation—the decision on the question of status being left to the First Federal House of Representatives which shall have been elected on the question of Status as the sole Issue. In a foregoing Section, I have repeated in extenso the views of Mr. Brailsford on this subject which I trust will be found helpful, both to our Muslim friends and the Princes as also to the Hindus and all the other communities who are directly interested in the future of our Country.

In order that the Muslims may have full freedom on the subject of Pakistan, the Federation proposed in this Formula leaves out the Muslim Provinces to start with, the Federation being restricted to the non-Muslim Provinces as the Primary Members. It also leaves out the Princes, who, like the Muslim Provinces, would be free to join the Federation as Acceding Members if they choose to do so.

Accession of Provinces and States

The Cripps Proposals provided that "His Majesty's Government would undertake to accept and implement forthwith the constitution so framed subject to:—

- (1) the right of any Province of British India that was not prepared to accept the new constitution to retain its present constitutional position, provision being made for its subsequent accession if it so decided.

With such non-acceding Provinces, should they so desire, His Majesty's Government would be prepared to agree upon a new constitution giving them the same full status as the Indian Union, and arrived at by a procedure analogous to that here laid down.

(2)....." (a)

The Congress Working Committee held:— (b)

"The acceptance beforehand of the novel principle of non-accession of a province is also a severe blow to the conception of Indian Unity and an apple of discord likely to generate growing trouble in the provinces, and which may well lead to further difficulties in the way of the Indian States merging themselves in the Indian Union.

.....

Nevertheless, the Committee cannot think in terms of compelling the people in any territorial unit to remain in an Indian Union against their declared and established will.

While recognising this principle, the committee feel that every effort should be made to create conditions which would help the different units in developing a common and co-operative national life.

.....

The proposal now made on the part of the British War Cabinet encourages and will lead to attempts at separation at the very inception of a union and thus create friction just when the utmost co-operation and goodwill are most needed."

To those of the Congress way of thinking it may be suggested—

- (a) that the Congress has accepted the principle that the people in any territorial unit cannot be compelled to remain in a Union against their declared and established will:
- (b) that the compulsory inclusion of such units in a Union would be a source of weakness to the Union, rather than of strength:
- (c) that it would help to secure solidarity for the Union if such non-conforming units were kept out:
- (d) that the inclusion of non-conforming units in the Union would be helpful only if conditions were created which would induce full agreement between such units and the other members of the Union:

Prof. Rushbrook Williams once observed 'the situation of these feudatory States, checkerboarding all-India as they do, is a great safeguard. It is like establishing a vast net-work of friendly fortresses in debatable territory. It would be difficult for a general rebellion against the British to sweep India because of this network of powerful, loyal Native States.' (c)

The Congress, in its criticism of the Cripps Plan, observed 'such States may....become barriers to the growth of Indian freedom, enclaves where foreign authority still prevails, and where the possibility of maintaining foreign armed forces has been stated to be a likely contingency.' (d)

(a) *Vide* page 45 ante.

(b) *V. de* page 47 ante.

(c) "SUBJECT INDIA" by H. N. Brailsford, page 56.

(d) *Vide* page 47 ante.

This would no doubt be a likely contingency requiring to be duly taken into account and provided against. There would certainly be risks in an arrangement which does not include the States. But the most effective and helpful safeguard would be that United India should acquire for herself adequate strength in the military sense with fully equipped Land, Sea and Air Forces of her own sufficient to meet external challenge from any quarter, either from the non-acceding territories of India or from any outsiders whatsoever. At the worst, it would be a race in armaments: and, normally, the honours would go to him who starts first and starts well.

The Plan suggested herein provides—

- (1) that certain Provinces and the Indian States shall be classed as acceding units, to start with:
- (2) that it leaves it to them to formulate their own terms on which they would be prepared to join the Union:
- (3) that such terms would be presented to and considered by the Constitution-Making Body on which such acceding units would be fully represented: and that only such agreed terms as are accepted by the acceding units shall be incorporated in the Constitution:
- (4) that, thereupon, if such acceding units desire to join the Union, they shall be free to do so:
- (5) but, having so joined the Union of their own free will, it shall not be open to them to go out until an initial period of 20 years has elapsed from the date of the inauguration of the Union.

Thus, my Plan would secure solidarity to the Union;

- (i) by keeping out acceding Provinces and States, thereby leaving the Union of Primary Members a compact body resting on the solid foundations of equality and unity flowing from an identity of interests: and
- (ii) if any or all of the acceding Provinces and States join the Union under my Plan, they would bring to the Union added strength resulting from mutual agreement, and through the provision barring secession for a period of 20 years assure to the Union continuity and solidarity during the vital initial stage of its corporate life.

If all the acceding Provinces join the Federation, there would be 11 Provinces in the Federation (British Baluchistan being attached to Sind or the North-West Frontier Province). To secure equality of representation to the Provinces and the States, the States, if they decide to join the Federation, shall be grouped into 11 State-Groups. The 11 Provinces and the 11 State-Groups shall have equal representation in the Federal Legislature. The grouping of the States into the above 11 Groups shall be determined by the Chamber of Princes in consultation with the All-India States Peoples Conference or any other body representing the States Subjects.

The basic principle of the Political Formula is the absolute EQUALITY it stipulates in all matters, as between

- the Hindus and the Muslims
- the Caste and the non-Caste Hindus
- the Upper and the Lower classes of the Muslims
- the Princes and their Subjects
- the Princes and their Subjects on the one hand, and the Peoples of the present British India Provinces on the other.

This arrangement would eliminate the apprehensions of the Muslims of being perpetually subjected to Hindu majority rule. It would place non-Caste-Hindus on a footing of equality with the Caste Hindus. It would similarly secure equality for the lower classes of the Muslims with their upper classes. Likewise, it would secure co-operation between the States Subjects and the Princes, and afford an opportunity to the Princes to take their due share in the administration of the Federation, thereby filling their rightful place as the natural leaders of India.

The above arrangement could only be made possible by the elimination of the other communities from the voting lobbies. The Formula embodies the Voluntary Renunciation of their right to vote by the smaller minority communities.

Residuary Powers—

In view of the adoption of the above basic principle of Equality, the Formula provides that the Residuary Powers shall vest in the Central Authority. The All-India Muslim League has been insisting on the Residual Powers vesting in the federating units. It has been apprehended that on the democratic principle of rule by majority, the Hindus with their majority would be the perpetual rulers at the Centre, that is, in the Federal Government, and that if Residual Powers were vested in the Federal Government, the Muslim majority Provinces would ultimately be squeezed into mere non-entities with all power practically centred in Hindu hands! The Congress latterly gave way and agreed to Residual Powers vesting in the Provinces.

Under my Plan, there would be no communal majority or minority in the Central Federal Legislature or Government; all communities would be equally placed, with power resting in their hands jointly on the basis of mutual equality. The apprehension of the Muslims would thus be eliminated. And, as it would always be desirable in the interests of the Union that the Central Government of a Sovereign State should be a strong body, capable, through its strength, of having its existence felt among its compeers in all parts of the world, the Plan provides that the Residual Powers shall vest in the Central Authority, namely, the Federal House of Representatives and Government.

Franchise—

The Formula provides for the widest possible Franchise, namely, Adult Franchise, the birth-right of every son and daughter of this ancient land.

Each person would be able to vote on his or her own community's electoral roll, voting for representatives of his or her own community on all legislative and other bodies. Since there would be no question of majority and minority involved at any stage, communal electorates would provide the most appropriate and convenient vehicle for ascertaining the community's mind.

Relations with Britain—

As mentioned above, my Formula contemplates an Independent India, under treaty relations with Britain. As Mr. Brailsford has observed,

"India will be as independent as the right hands of her armed men, her steel mills and her engineering shops make her. Parchments and proclamations cannot confer independence, they can only describe what muscle and steel have won.

An industrially backward country, even if its man-power enables it to mobilise greater armies than the aggressor can put into the field, may have

to abandon for a period of years, as China has had to do, immense and fertile territories, counting itself fortunate that vast distances and poor communications enable it to prolong its resistance in the far interior. Its hopes of recovering what it has lost depend on the precarious help it receives from wealthier Powers which can manufacture the arguments of justice. In these days, when the Panzer Divisions of one Great Power can range at will over Europe, while a thousand bombers scatter ruin in a single night over her cities, how many nations are effectively independent? Mechanised warfare, but more especially air-power, have shattered the old-world concept of sovereignty. Independence has become what mathematicians would call a function of heavy industry."

This is the lesson of the present war, a lesson which the Independent India of Tomorrow cannot afford to ignore. We shall have to shelve for a time many a cherished ideal, including the ideal of Non-Violence: for a time we shall even have to relegate to the background all our plans for the betterment of our masses: we shall have to concentrate all our attention, all our will, all our energy and all our resources in bringing into existence more and more steel mills, more and more engineering shops, training and maintaining more and more fighting men including fighting airmen, manufacturing more and more armaments, more and more guns and tanks, building more and more warships, and, above all, more and more war-planes. India's geographical position is such that the nearest Great Power would be thousands of miles away from her: the vast distances would necessarily affect the effective value of a military alliance with any Great Power. Independent India would have to depend upon herself for the protection of her Independence. By her geographical position she is destined to become the Great Power of all South Asia. It would have to be the first task of the government of Independent India to see to it that Independent India became strong on land, on sea and in the air, in the shortest possible time sufficiently strong to be able to face and overcome any attempt at aggression against her from any quarter whatsoever. Only so would Independent India be able to secure her Independence: only then would it be time for her to divert her attention to plans of internal development. The National Government of Independent India should be able to attract to the surface all the wealth that is believed to lie buried underground: vis-a-vis Britain, India today (August 1943) is a creditor country holding Sterling balances in London equivalent to over 650 crores of rupees, a position which must improve still further while the war lasts: besides, there is sufficient wealth in the Country to provide all or most of the funds that might be required for our armaments: and Independent India would expect that her National Government should have the will and the strength to raise all the requisite funds by equitable taxation even though it were to involve taxation to the breaking point.

The Treaty with Britain suggested in the Plan of this work envisages the provision of a nucleus of the armaments of Independent India, and Britain's part in providing it.

In the event of Britain declining, for any reason, to assist United India with the sale to her of the necessary units of armaments as above, the Constitution includes a provision which enables the Federal Government of the day to negotiate a like Treaty with any other Power that may be prepared to assist this Country in this vital matter.

In her fiscal relations with Britain, this Country would, under the Treaty, allow her a certain Preference in Tariffs. This would be in consideration of

past associations and any present and future assistance India might receive from Great Britain. The Preference would not apply to the Dominions comprised in the British Commonwealth.

Revision of the Constitution—

It will be observed that a much heavier majority (four-fifths) is laid down in the case of a revision of the Constitution than when it would be framed in the first instance (namely, two-thirds), the reason being that in the latter case the Acceding Members would have the freedom to join the Federation or to stand out if they did not approve of the Constitution, while in the former case, once they joined in, they would not be able to go out for the initial period of 20 years: Hence, in the interests of the Acceding Members, it would be advisable that any alteration of the Constitution could only be effected with the support of not less than four-fifths of the members of the Federal Legislature.

3—MAXIMS

Forget

The Proposals given herein are presented without any reference to the past, as such reference might tempt one to delve into records which would be the surest way for one to get lost in the maze of the controversies of the past. The essential need of the hour, as I conceive it, is that men should approach present day questions and their suggested solutions with a fresh outlook and an open mind, considering them in relation to the circumstances and from the viewpoints as prevail today, not as existed yesterday. I would therefore wish my Readers to obliterate the past from their minds right up to today—right up to this moment.

Remember

(a) We Muslims and Hindus are not united: therefore we are weak: we have not the strength to win Freedom: therefore our subjection persists: if we want to win Freedom, we must acquire the strength to do so: if we want to get the strength, we Muslims and Hindus must unite:

(b) if we want to unite, we must remove the causes of disunity: we must create platforms of Unity:

(c) we must create Trust where Distrust has prevailed:

(d) when parties follow extreme courses, they are furthest apart: the gulf dividing them is the widest: Wisdom points to the Middle Course: when parties follow the Middle Course, they are closest to each other, the prospects of bridging the dividing gulf the brightest:

(e) men desiring to follow the Middle Course must be prepared to make sacrifices, must 'give and take,' and allow free-play to their human sympathies: they must induce in themselves the spirit of Tolerance and Forbearance, the sense of Justice and Fairplay, Goodwill and Brotherliness:

(f) nothing is perfect in this imperfect world: men are not perfect: constitutions are not perfect: experience has shown that many a plan perfect in theory has had to undergo considerable modification before it could be worked successfully: this is true of constitutional theories: constitutions based on pedantic theories have failed in practice: constitutions must be made to suit men, their condition and their requirements—not that men, their condition and their requirements should be made to adapt themselves to theoretical constitutions: for Indians, an indigenous constitution fitting in with their peculiar condition and requirements would alone succeed—to attempt to foist on them a constitution that may be perfect in theory, or that has succeeded in Britain, Canada, Australia, or elsewhere, but which is incompatible with the Indian genius, would be to invite certain failure:

(g) constitutions suffering from Inequality and Injustice cannot endure: for constitutions to endure, they must be broad-based on Justice and Equality: our future Indian constitution, if it is to endure, must secure Justice and Equality for all our countrymen alike.

4—PRINCIPLES

The future CONSTITUTION of United India shall be based on the following Principles:—

(1) Muslims and United India (Pakistan)

PAKISTAN shall be agreed to in principle: that is to say, it shall be open to the British India Provinces of Sind, British Baluchistan, North-West Frontier Province, the Punjab, and Bengal, to keep out from the Federation of United India, if they so choose: at the same time, it shall be open to them, if they so choose, to join the Federation as Acceding Members.

(2) States and United India

Similarly, it shall be open to the Indian States to keep out from the Federation of United India, if they so choose: at the same time, it shall be open to them, if they so choose, to join the Federation as Acceding Members. If the States join the Federation of United India,

- (i) the Princes shall introduce representative institutions and responsible government within their territories:
- (ii) inter-communal relations within the States shall be regulated as under (3) below:
- (iii) the Princes and the States Subjects shall have equal rights and equality of representation, vis-a-vis the other members of the Federation, on the Federal Legislature and in the Federal Services.

(3) Inter-Communal Relations

- (a) As between the Muslims and the Hindus, there shall be Equality of Representation

- (i) on all Legislative and Public Bodies, and
 - (ii) in the Public Services.

Their social relations shall be governed by the TREATY OF PERPETUAL PEACE AND CONCORD BETWEEN THE MUSLIMS AND THE HINDUS OF UNITED INDIA.

- (b) There shall similarly be Equality of Representation

- (i) on all Legislative and Public Bodies, and
 - (ii) in the Public Servicesas between.

- (I) Upper Class Muslims
 - and
 - Lower Class Muslims

- (II) Caste Hindus
 - and
 - Non-Caste Hindus

- (c) Separate Communal Electorates.

The Muslims claim that they are a nation. So do the Hindus. The Hindus claim that all Indians, Hindus, Muslims and the other communities, constitute a single nation, the Indian Nation. The

Muslims deny this claim. In the interests of Amity and Concord, it is deemed desirable and advisable that the existing differences should be recognised and that until such time as universal education and mutual friendly intercourse succeed in blunting the separatist urge and the sharp edges of the present differences, the Muslims and the Hindus shall be treated as separate Nations, and their representation on legislatures, etc., shall be provided through separate communal electorates.

(4) States and the British Crown—

- (i) If the States join the Federation of United India, their existing Treaties with the Crown shall be deemed to stand in abeyance for such period as the States remain members of the Federation:
- (ii) if the States do not join the Federation,
 - (I) their relations with the Crown shall continue to be governed by their treaties:
 - (II) their relations with the Federation shall be governed by a Treaty to be concluded with the Federation:
- (iii) if the States, after joining the Federation, secede from it at any time, their position on secession shall be as per (ii) (I) & (II) above.

(5) United India and Britain—

Their future relations shall be governed by the decision of United India whether her future status shall be

- (i) INDEPENDENCE, or
- (ii) DOMINION STATUS.

The terms of such relations shall be embodied in a Treaty as outlined in THE TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN UNITED INDIA AND BRITAIN given herein.

(6) United India and External Relations—

The relations of United India with

- (i) PAKISTAN
- (ii) INDIAN STATES
- (iii) Britain
- (iv) Other Foreign States

} If they do not join the Federation of United India

shall be governed by Treaties to be concluded with them on the basis of United India being an Independent Sovereign State.

(7) The War—

It shall be a *sine qua non*

- (i) that at the Peace Conference that may be assembled to evolve the Peace Treaty following upon the conclusion of the present War, India shall be represented by Indians chosen by India:
- (ii) that any representatives to the Peace Conference appointed by the present Government of India, or the Secretary of State for India, or

the British Government; cannot be deemed to be representatives of India chosen by Indians:

- (iii) that pending the inauguration of the Federal Constitution of United India, an alternative arrangement that might prove acceptable to Indians shall be as under:—
- (a) that patriotic Indians with the requisite qualifications in industry, finance, economics, etc., might be invited to offer themselves for election as India's representatives on the Indian Peace Delegation:
 - (b) that the Legislatures (Lower Houses) now functioning, and those which were functioning before Section 93 of the Government of India Act, 1935, was applied in the Provinces, might be called upon to elect the requisite number of representatives to the Peace Delegation out of those who might have offered themselves under sub-Clause (a) above:
 - (c) that such elected representatives shall function at the Peace Conference with all the rights possessed by the representatives of Free Powers:
 - (d) that if the Secretary of State for India is sent to the Peace Conference, he may serve on the British Delegation: he shall not be a member of the Indian Delegation and shall not be entitled to speak on behalf of India:
 - (e) that the Peace Treaty that eventually may come to be concluded, and in the framing of which India shall have been represented as above, shall be subject to ratification by the Federal Government of United India that shall have come into being by then:
- (iv) that failing the above arrangement, any PEACE TREATY that may come to be concluded shall be binding on United India only to the extent outlined in the Draft Treaty between United India and Britain outlined in a subsequent Section.
-

5—THE STATE

The State

The future STATE of India shall be a Federation styled "UNITED INDIA" composed of territorial units comprising certain existing Provinces of British India as Primary Members of the Federation.

Its Status

UNITED INDIA shall be a SOVEREIGN STATE, having complete Independence, complete Autonomy, external and internal, as recognised in International Law, with full powers to conclude Treaties, declare War and make Peace.

Its Sovereignty to rest in a Federal House of Representatives

The State shall be represented and governed by a *Federal House of Representatives* in which its sovereignty shall rest. The executive authority shall vest in a *Council of Five (PUNCH)* and a *Cabinet of Ministers*, deriving their authority from the Federal House of Representatives.

The Council of Five (THE PUNCH)

The Head of the State shall be the Council of Five (PUNCH—QUINQUE-VIRI), composed as under:—

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| (1) A Muslim Prince | } | to be elected by the
Federal Assembly. |
| (2) A Muslim Commoner | | |
| (3) A Hindu Prince | | |
| (4) A Hindu Commoner | | |
| (5) A non-Muslim-Hindu | | |

The Sur-Punch

The Council shall elect one out of the first four in rotation to be the Presiding Authority of the Council, who shall be styled the "SUR-PUNCH OF (सर पंच) UNITED INDIA" who shall hold office for a year in the following order:—

- for the first year—the Muslim Prince
,, ,, second ,, —the Hindu Commoner
,, ,, third ,, —the Muslim Commoner
,, ,, fourth ,, —the Hindu Prince

The above order shall be subject to variation at the discretion of the Council.

The determination of Foreign Policy, the power to declare War and to make Peace, and the ultimate authority over the armed forces of the Country shall vest in the Council of Five with the concurrence of the Cabinet: the declaration of war and the making of peace shall be subject to ratification by the Federal House of Representatives.

The other powers and functions of the Council of Five and the Cabinet of Ministers shall be as may be defined by the Constitution.

The members of the Council on election thereto shall cease to take active part in the proceedings of the Federal House of Representatives: they will retain their seats thereon, but if they attend its sittings, they shall do so as Observers only.

The "SUR-PUNCH" shall be the ultimate titular Head of the State for Ceremonial and other Formal Functions, his position corresponding to that of a Constitutional Monarch or the President of a Republic.

Composition of Federation of United India

The Federation of United India shall comprise the British India Provinces of Bihar, United Provinces, Assam, Orissa, Madras, Bombay, Central Provinces and Berar, which shall be deemed to be the *Primary Members* of the Federation.

The British India Provinces of

Sind, British Baluchistan, Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, and Bengal, and the State-Groups as may be evolved by the Chamber of Princes in consultation with a body representing the States Subjects, shall, if and when they join the Federation, be deemed to be the *Acceding Members* of the Federation.

Each Federating Member, whether Primary or Acceding, shall enjoy perfect autonomy and sovereignty within its territorial limits, subject only to its own laws and such Federal Laws as may become applicable to it under the Federal Constitution.

The Primary Members shall be the Permanent Members of the Federation who shall be deemed to have agreed to hold their inherent right to secede from the Federation in suspension during the life of the Federation, and to have bound themselves to continue to be Members of the Federation until the Federation comes to be dissolved or for such shorter period as shall be provided in the Constitution.

The Acceding Members shall be deemed to be Members at will, free to exercise their right to secede any time on and after the expiry of the period of first 20 years of the life of the Federation as shall be provided in the Constitution.

If any of the Provinces named above as the Acceding Provinces, or if any State-Group, desire to join the Federation as a Primary Member, it shall be open to it to do so.

For the purposes of the Treaty with Britain referred to later in this Part, United India shall be deemed to comprise all the Primary Members alone: the liabilities to be assumed by United India under the Treaty vis-a-vis Britain shall attach jointly to the Primary Members alone: the share of the Acceding Members in these liabilities, vis-a-vis the Primary Members, shall be determined by mutual agreement between the Primary Members and the Acceding Members, for the determination of which there shall be an enabling provision included in the Constitution.

6—THE CONSTITUTION—MAKING BODY

Its Constitution

The Constitution of the Federation shall be framed by a Constitution-Making Body constituted as under :—

Each of the existing Provincial Legislatures shall pass legislation enabling the existing electors on the Province to elect 8 persons to represent the Province on the Constitution-Making Body. The representatives to be elected shall comprise:—

Muslims—Upper Classes	2
„ —Lower „	2
Hindus—Caste	2
„ —Non-Caste	2
	<hr/>
	8
	<hr/>
Total for 11 Provinces	88

It shall not be necessary that the persons offering for election shall be registered on the Provincial Electoral Rolls.

The results of elections shall be determined as follows:—

The Muslim candidates offering themselves for election shall be classified into (a) Upper Classes, and (b) Lower Classes, candidates according to the classification of Lower Classes adopted for the purposes of the Census. Then, in the case of each Province, two candidates of the Upper Classes Muslims securing the highest number of votes shall be deemed to have been elected as the representatives of the Muslim Upper Classes. Similarly, two candidates of the Muslim Lower Classes securing the highest number of votes shall be deemed to have been elected as the representatives of the Muslim Lower Classes.

The above arrangement shall also be adopted in determining the election of the representatives of the Caste and non-Caste Hindus.

The Chamber of Princes shall elect or nominate 44 members from among their Order to represent the Princes on the Constitution-Making Body, the representatives being in the proportion of 50% Hindu Princes and the other 50% Muslim Princes.

In addition to these, 6 Ruling Princes from among the Sikh States shall be elected by the Sikh Ruling Princes to be members of the Constitution—Making Body as Advisory Members.

[NOTE—I believe the enlightened Princely Order does not stand in need of representation on communal lines. However, since the rest of the Constitution—Making Body is proposed to be constituted on communal basis, this plan provides for the representation of the Princes also on communal lines so as to maintain communal equipoise in this important Body.

Under the Chapter headed “ESSENTIALS” in this Part it is provided that, with a view to securing the country’s solidarity on the basis of inter-communal Unity, certain minority communities, including the Sikhs, should, while taking full and effective part in the administration of the country in an advisory capacity, make a Voluntary Declaration renouncing their right of VOTE. Accordingly, while the voting strength of the Princes on the Constitution—Making Body, namely, 44, shall be equally distributed between the major communities, namely, 22 Muslim Princes and 22 Hindu Princes, the Plan provides that, with a view to ensuring adequate representation to the important Section of the Princely Order, viz., the Sikh States, the Princes’

representation shall be strengthened by the addition of 6 Sikh Princes who shall, however, serve on the Constitution—Making Body in an Advisory capacity only.

On the principle of EQUALITY, the Plan provides the same strength of representation on this Body to the Sikh Commoners, namely, 3 from the States and 3 from the British India Provinces, in the same capacity, namely, Advisory capacity.]

The All-India States Subjects Conference or other body representing the States Subjects shall elect or nominate 44 members to represent the States Subjects on the Constitution-Making Body, the representatives being restricted to the Hindu and the Muslim communities in the following proportion;—

Muslims—Upper Classes	11
„ —Lower „	11
Hindus—Caste	11
„ —Non-Caste	11
	<u>44</u>

The entire Anglo-Indian, Indian Christian and Parsee communities, as all-India units, shall nominate 6 members each from amongst themselves to represent their respective communities on the Constitution—Making Body.

Its Composition

The Constitution—Making Body shall thus comprise

Voting Members—From the 11 Provinces	88
„ „ States:	
Princes	44
Subjects	<u>44</u>
	88

Members in Advisory Capacity:

Sikhs-Princes	6	
Commoners	6	3 from British India Provinces, 3 from the States.
Anglo-Indians	6	
Indian Christians	6	
Parsees	<u>6</u>	
		30
		<u>206</u>

At stages of the deliberations of the Constitution-Making Body wherever voting is resorted to, such voting shall be restricted to the representatives of the Hindu and Muslim communities only, both from the States and the Provinces, the Sikhs, Anglo-Indians, Indian Christians and the Parsees taking part in the deliberations in an advisory capacity only.

Conduct of Business—

The Constitution-Making Body shall elect a Panel of 4 or 8 persons from amongst the 30 Advisory Members to preside at its deliberations.

Matters of difference shall be decided by taking votes, a two-thirds majority in favour being necessary for the adoption of any measure.

Function—

The function of the Constitution-Making Body shall be to frame a Constitution for the Federation of United India as a Sovereign State.

The Constitution shall include provisions which would enable its being adapted with necessary adjustments to a Dominion of the British Commonwealth, in case the Status of a Dominion is eventually decided upon.

7—CONSTITUTION

The Constitution of United India shall be based on the PRINCIPLES laid down in an earlier Section, and shall include provisions embodied in later Sections under the heads FUNDAMENTALS and ESSENTIALS.

The STATE, its STATUS, its GOVERNMENT, and its COMPOSITION shall be as defined in an earlier Section.

Accession of Acceding Members

The Provinces of Sind, British Baluchistan, Punjab, North-West Frontier, and Bengal, shall draw up for themselves a draft Instrument of Accession containing the terms on which they may be prepared to join the Federation.

Similarly, the Chamber of Princes, and the Indian States Subjects Conference or other Body representing the Peoples of the States, shall in mutual consultation jointly draw up a draft Instrument of Accession on which the States may be prepared to join the Federation.

The above draft Instruments of Accession shall be presented to the Constitution-Making Body who shall evolve in consultation with the representatives of the above Provinces, the Chamber of Princes and the States Subjects, agreed Instruments.

Acceding Provinces and the Indian States shall thereupon either

- (a) adopt their respective Instrument, or
- (b) reject it.

In the former case, the Instrument, on adoption by the concerned parties, shall be incorporated in the Constitution, and the next step for the parties shall be to join the Federation as Acceding Members.

In the latter case, it shall be open to them to

- (i) continue their *status quo* under the Government of India Act, 1935, or
- (ii) frame a constitution of their own for themselves to be negotiated by them with Britain direct.

The Legislatures

The Federation shall have a single Legislative Chamber, styled the Federal House of Representatives.

Similarly, there shall be a single Legislative Chamber, styled the House of Representatives, in each of the Primary Member Provinces and also in the Acceding Member Provinces and State-Groups that may choose to come under the Constitution.

Life of Legislatures

The life of all Legislatures, Federal, Provincial, and States, shall ordinarily be eight years.

Franchise

Every adult, male or female, who does not suffer from the usual disqualifications, *e. g.*, insanity, moral turpitude, etc., shall be eligible to vote at elections to the Provincial, States and Federal Legislatures. He or she shall also be eligible to stand for election to any of these Legislatures.

Electorates

Communal Electorates, as provided in the Section headed **ESSENTIALS** shall be constituted in suitable territorial units.

The same electorates shall elect representatives to the Federal and to the Provincial and States Legislatures, as also to Local Bodies.

The elections to all these bodies shall synchronise as far as possible and the order of election shall ordinarily be as follows:

FIRSTLY, to the Federal House of Representatives,

SECONDLY, to the Provincial and States Houses of Representatives,
and,

THIRDLY, to the Local Bodies.

Representation on Legislatures

The representation on the Provincial and States Houses of Representatives and to the Local Bodies shall be as provided in the Section headed **ESSENTIALS**

On the assumption that all the Acceding Provinces and the States will join the Federation, the representation on the Federal House of Representatives of the 11 Provinces and the 11 State-Groups shall be as under:—

Each Province shall have the following representation:—

HINDUS		MUSLIMS	
Caste	2	Upper Classes	2
Non-Caste	2	Lower	2
	<hr/> 4		<hr/> 4

Total per Province 8

For 11 Provinces 88 as under—

Muslims	44
Hindus	44
	<hr/> 88

Each State-Group shall have the following representation:—

HINDUS		MUSLIMS	
Princes	2	Princes	2
Subjects:		Subjects:	
Caste	1	Upper Class	1
Non-Caste	1	Lower	1
	<hr/> 4		<hr/> 4

Total per State-Group 8

For 11 State-Groups 88 as under—

Muslims	44
Hindus	44
	<hr/> 88

The representation on the Federal House of Representatives shall be as under:—

I

HINDUS 88 (50%)

Provinces 44 (50%)			States 44 (50%)	
Caste 22 (12.5%)	Non-Caste 22 (12.5%)	Princes 22 (12.5%)	Peoples 22 (12.5%)	
			Caste 11 (6.25%)	Non-Caste 11 (6.25%)

II

MUSLIMS 88 (50%)

Provinces 44 (50%)			States 44 (50%)	
Higher Classes 22 (12.5%)	Lower Classes 22 (12.5%)	Prince 22 (12.5%)	Peoples 22 (12.5%)	
			Upper Classes 11 (6.25%)	Lower Classes 11 (6.25%)

	PRINCES	CASTE	NON-CASTE	TOTAL	
HINDUS	22	33	33	88	} VOTING
		UPPER	LOWER		
		CLASSES	CLASSES		
MUSLIMS	22	33	33	88	
SUBJECTS					
SIKHS	6	..	6	12	} NON-VOTING
ANGLO-INDIANS	6	
INDIAN CHRISTIANS	6	
PARSEES	6	
				206	

There shall ordinarily be no special representation for special interests, e. g., Commerce, Universities, etc., but it shall be open to any Legislature, should it so desire, to invite representatives of such interests to serve on such Legislatures in an Advisory capacity.

Representation in Services

The Communal Proportion in the Services shall be as provided in the Section headed ESSENTIALS.

First Elections

(a) FEDERAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

When the Constitution-Making Body has evolved a Constitution, and when it has been accepted by the federating units by a four-fifths majority, and when it becomes operative on the passing of the necessary legislation by the British Parliament, the existing Administrations in the federating units shall prepare electoral rolls according to such franchise as may be laid down in the Constitution, and shall, firstly, hold elections to the First Federal House of Representatives.

On the First Federal House of Representatives coming into being in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, the Constitution-Making Body shall, *ipso facto*, stand dissolved.

(b) PROVINCIAL AND STATES HOUSES OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Electorates constituted as above shall, secondly, hold elections to the First Provincial and States Houses of Representatives.

Conduct of Business

Business in the Houses of Representatives, Federal, Provincial or States, shall be conducted, as far as possible, on the following lines.

Federal House-Council of Five (Punch)

The House shall, at its first sitting, elect the COUNCIL OF FIVE (PUNCH), as outlined under the Section headed 'THE STATE, ITS COMPOSITION, &c.' One of the non-voting members shall take the chair during the election of the Council, as also the subsequent elections of Speakers, etc.

There shall be no such Councils in the Provinces or the States, neither there shall be any Provincial Governors, the executive authority in these cases vesting in the respective Cabinets functioning under the Constitution, with, in the case of the States, the Ruler as the Constitutional Head of the State acting with the advice of his Cabinet.

Speakers

The House shall elect two Speakers, one a Hindu and the other a Muslim. The election of the Muslim Speaker shall be made by the Muslim members: that of the Hindu Speaker by the Hindu members. Which of these two shall take office first shall be decided by lot. Each shall hold office for four years. Suppose the Muslim Speaker draws the lot for office for the first four years, the constituency that returned him shall be asked to elect another Muslim for the period of four years, who shall resign when the Muslim Speaker vacates the chair and joins the ranks at the end of his term.

The same procedure shall be adopted when the Hindu Speaker occupies the chair.

Prime Ministers

The Hindu Members shall elect their Leader from amongst themselves.

The Muslim Members shall elect their Leader from amongst themselves.

These Leaders shall become Prime Ministers, by turn, for terms of two years each.

As soon as the first elections of Leaders have been made, lots shall be drawn as to who shall take office first. The successful Leader shall thereupon form a Cabinet.

The Prime Minister shall have a casting vote in addition to his own vote.

Each Prime Minister shall hold office for two years, but shall be eligible for re-election as Leader by the respective Community Members, and if so re-elected, he shall continue as Prime Minister and form his Cabinet on the above lines: If he is not re-elected, the new Leader shall become the Prime Minister for the next two years and will form his own Cabinet.

All Ministers shall place their resignations in the hands of the Prime Minister yearly, but shall be eligible for re-appointment.

The appointment of all Ministers, both Hindus and Muslims, both voting and non-voting, shall rest solely with the Prime Minister for the time being.

At the end of the fourth year, it shall be the other Community's turn to fill the Prime Minister's post: and the above procedure shall apply for the second term of four years.

Cabinets

(a)—FEDERAL

The Federal Cabinet shall consist of 16 Ministers, with or without portfolios, but with the vote, comprised as under:—

HINDUS		MUSLIMS		
Princes	2		2	STATES
Subjects				
Caste	1	Upper Classes	1	
Non-Caste	1	Lower „	1	
Caste	2	Upper Classes	2	PROVINCES
Non-Caste	2	Lower „	2	
	<u>8</u>		<u>8</u>	

In addition to the above, there shall be Extra Ministers as under, with or without portfolio, but without the vote:—

SIKH	PRINCE	1		
	COMMONER	1	INDIAN CHRISTIAN	1
ANGLO INDIAN		1	PARSEE	1

These shall be in the Cabinet in an Advisory capacity only.

(b)—PROVINCIAL & STATES CABINETS.

The Provincial and States Cabinets shall consist of 8 Ministers, with or without portfolios, but with the vote, comprised as under:—

HINDUS		MUSLIMS	
Caste	2	Upper Classes	2
Non-Caste	2	Lower „	2
	<u>4</u>		<u>4</u>

In addition to the above, there shall be

SIKH	1
ANGLO INDIAN	1
INDIAN CHRISTIAN	1
PARSEE	1
	<u>4</u>

Extra Ministers, with or without portfolios, but without the vote: these shall be in the Cabinet in an Advisory capacity only.

Conventions

The following CONVENTIONS shall invariably be adopted in all Legislatures, namely, that matters affecting the religion or personal law of either the Muslims or the Hindus shall not be discussed, nor legislation affecting the same shall be moved, in any Legislature, except at the instance of the members of the Legislatures belonging to the Community concerned:

In the case of the Sikh Community, such questions shall be dealt with in the House of Representatives of the Punjab alone, and the discussion and the voting shall be restricted to the Sikh Members of that House alone: in the case of the Anglo Indian, Indian Christian and Parsee Communities, legislation or other measures desired by them shall be drawn up by the Community concerned, and adopted by a plebiscite of the Community based on all its communal electorates all over the Country: such agreed legislation or measures shall thereupon be submitted for formal adoption to the Federal House of Representatives by its representatives on that House, and the same shall be adopted by the House as a matter of course. If the plebiscite shows less than three-fourths in favour of the legislation or measure, by a small margin of say about five per cent. (for instance if the plebiscite showed 73% for and 27% against), the members of the Community concerned on the Federal House of Representatives shall vote on the legislation or the measure between themselves and the same shall be adopted or rejected by the House according to the result of such voting. In the case of a tie, the proposed legislation or measure shall be referred back to the Community concerned for a fresh plebiscite:

The Cabinets, both Federal and Provincial, shall function on the principle of COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY: (Such an arrangement would safeguard the rights of each Section, the Princes vis-a-vis the Commoners, the Muslims vis-a-vis the Hindus, the non-Caste Hindus against the Caste Hindus, the lower Classes Muslims against the Upper Classes Muslims. If the rights of any section are adversely affected by any decision of the Cabinet as a whole, and if that section feels it to be its duty to protest against such decision, the Minister concerned will have the remedy of resigning, which, ordinarily, shall mean the break-up of the Cabinet).

Powers and Functions.

The Federal House of Representatives shall have any or all of the following Powers and Functions, namely, to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, and to deal with trade, shipping, railways, posts and telegraphs, broadcasting, defence, census, currency, coining, banking, bankruptcy, copyright, patents, weights and measures, immigration and emigration, etc.

The Federal House of Representatives shall also have the power of borrowing on the credit of the Federal State.

The respective Functions of the Federal Government and the Governments of the Federating Units shall be specifically defined in the Constitution.

Residuary Powers.

The Residuary Powers shall rest in the Federal House and Government.

Federal Court
Federal Railway Authority
Reserve Bank

These institutions, as introduced and operating under the Government of India Act of 1935 shall be adopted and the relative provisions incorporated in the Federal Constitution with such amendments, etc., if any, as may be found to be necessary.

Revision of Constitution

A four-fifths majority in the Federal House of Representatives shall be necessary for any revision of the Constitution.

Secession of Acceding Members

In the 18th year of the Treaty with Britain it shall be open to the Acceding Members of the Federation to decide for themselves whether they will continue to remain members of the Federation, or exercise their right of secession and secede therefrom on giving the Federal Government the notice provided for on this page. Such decision shall take effect at the end of the 20th year of the Treaty with Britain.

Where a State Unit which comprises more than one State decides as a Unit to secede, and as a result of such decision secedes from the Federation, such States in such Group as individually are desirous of re-joining the Federation, may attach themselves to such other Group-Units as the Chamber of Princes and the All-India States Subjects Conference or other Body representing the States Subjects may jointly determine, and re-join the Federation as members of such Group-Units.

Relations with Britain on the Termination of the First Treaty

The third elections to the Federal House of Representatives, which shall be held in the 16th year of the life of the Federation, shall be held on the main issue whether the Treaty with Britain shall be renewed, revised, replaced by another, or be allowed to lapse. The mandate of the electorate shall be implemented, when the time arrives, that is, about the 19th year, by the Primary Members and such Acceding Members who may not have given notice to secede and who consequently shall be deemed to have decided to adhere to the Federation.

The liabilities undertaken by United India under the renewed, amended or new Treaty with Britain shall again remain attached to the Primary Members alone as in the case of the original Treaty, the share of the Acceding Members in these liabilities being determined as in Section 5 above.

Dissolution of Federation

The inherent right of each Member of the Federation, whether Primary or Acceding, to secede from the Federation, shall not be exercisable for the first 20 years of the life of the Federation. Thereafter, it shall similarly be not exercisable by the Primary Members for the life of the extended or fresh Treaty with Britain. Thereafter, the right shall be exercisable by the Primary Members at the end of every 10 years.

Acceding Members shall, after the first period of 20 years from the inauguration of the Federation, be free to exercise their right to secede from the Federation any time thereafter on giving the Federal Government two years' notice of their intention to secede.

If at the end of any period of 10 years referred to in sub-clause 1 of this Clause, the secessions cause the number of Primary and Acceding Members willing to continue in the Federation to fall below four, the Federation shall *ipso facto* be deemed to stand dissolved.

Pakistan

If the Muslims do not agree to join the Federation of United India, the following arrangement shall become operative as between the Muslims and the Hindus:

- (1) Pakistan shall be deemed to have been accepted:

- (2) The Inter-Communal Treaty (given in the Section headed FUNDAMENTALS) shall be deemed to have been adopted by both the Muslims and the Hindus: .
 - (3) Each shall make their own choice as to their status, that is, whether it shall be Independence or Dominion Status: .
 - (4) Pakistan and Hindustan may have separate Treaties with Britain:
 - (5) The States may join either Pakistan or Hindustan or continue under their Treaties with the Paramount Power:
 - (6) Hindustan may, if it so chooses, have Joint Electorates with Proportional Representation in Legislatures and Services:
Pakistan may, if it so chooses, have Separate Electorates with Proportional Representation in Legislatures and Services:
Hindustan, or Pakistan, or both, may have Joint or Separate Electorates as they may choose, with, if they so choose, EQUALITY of representation as between Muslims and Hindus, as also between Upper and Lower Class Muslims and between Caste and non-Caste Hindus, as provided earlier in this Constitution.
 - (7) Generally, the rights of minorities shall be safeguarded as per the All India Muslim League's Lahore Resolution of 1940, namely, "that adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in these regions (i.e., Pakistan units and regions) for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them; and in other parts of India where the Mussalmans are in a minority, adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards shall be specially provided in the constitution for them and other minorities for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with them."
-

8—FUNDAMENTALS

THAT SHALL BE INCORPORATED IN THE CONSTITUTION

The following matters, being FUNDAMENTAL in essence, shall be incorporated in the Constitution :—

- (A) FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE CITIZENS OF UNITED INDIA.
 - (B) THE TREATY OF PERPETUAL PEACE AND CONCORD BETWEEN
THE MUSLIMS AND THE HINDUS OF UNITED INDIA.
(THE COMMUNAL FORMULA).
 - (C) MANDATE TO THE FIRST FEDERAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE PRINCIPLES OF
A TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP
BETWEEN
UNITED INDIA AND BRITAIN.
-

A—FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE CITIZENS OF UNITED INDIA

- (1) Every Citizen of United India shall have the right of free expression of opinion, the right of free association and combination, and the right to assemble peacefully and without arms for a purpose not opposed to law and morality:
- (2) Every Citizen shall enjoy freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess and practise his religion, subject to public order and morality:
- (3) The culture, language and script of every Citizen shall be protected:
- (4) All Citizens shall be equal before the law, irrespective of religion, caste, creed or sex:
- (5) No disability shall attach to any Citizen by reason of his or her religion, caste, creed, or sex, in regard to public employment, office of power or honour, or in the exercise of any trade or calling:
- (6) All Citizens shall have equal rights and duties in regard to the wells, tanks, roads, schools, and places of public resort, maintained out of State or Local Funds, or dedicated by private persons for the use of the general public:
- (7) No Citizen shall be deprived of his liberty, nor shall his dwelling or property be entered, sequestered, or confiscated, save in accordance with the law:
- (8) The State shall observe neutrality in regard to all religions:
- (9) The franchise shall be on the basis of universal adult suffrage:
- (10) The State shall provide free and compulsory primary education:
- (11) Every Citizen shall be free to move throughout United India and to stay and settle in any part thereof, to acquire property and to follow any trade or calling, and to be treated equally with regard to legal prosecution or protection in all parts of United India:
- (12) The State shall provide free medical aid:
- (13) The State shall provide Unemployment Insurance and Disabilities and Old Age Pensions.

B—THE COMMUNAL FORMULA

The inter-communal relations between the Muslims and the Hindus shall be governed by a TREATY OF PERPETUAL PEACE AND CONCORD between the Communities as outlined below:—

THE TREATY OF PERPETUAL PEACE AND CONCORD BETWEEN THE MUSLIMS AND THE HINDUS OF UNITED INDIA

We, the Muslims and the Hindus of United India, after mature consideration and of our own free will freely exercised, hereby record, in the presence of Almighty God, the Lord of Nations and of Nations' Destinies, our full agreement and concurrence in this Solemn Treaty of Perpetual Peace and Concord between the Muslims and the Hindus of United India, the terms whereof shall be

- (1) This TREATY shall remain in force for a period of 25 years, and shall be renewable by mutual agreement for further periods ad infinitum :
- (2) Being a Solemn Covenant solemnly entered into in the presence of the Almighty Lord, it shall not be open to either party to the Covenant to repudiate it or to infringe any of its terms in any way during the life of the Covenant :
- (3) It is hereby agreed that the Covenants governing inter-communal relations herein embodied shall form the foundations and the groundwork on which the future Constitution of United India shall rest, and shall in essence be incorporated in such Constitution :
- (4) The following VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS OF AMITY AND CONCORD, recording the arrangements freely arrived at by mutual agreement between the Muslims and the Hindus of United India on the subjects covered by the agreements, are incorporated in this TREATY as an integral part thereof :

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS OF AMITY AND CONCORD

(a) Cow Sacrifice and Cow Protection

“Whereas it is customary with certain communities in the performance of their religious rites and ceremonials to offer animal sacrifices, including cow sacrifice, and whereas it is customary with certain other communities in the observance of their religious persuasions to attach religious significance to certain animals including the cow whose preservation is deemed by them as enjoined on them by the tenets of their beliefs, and whereas it is the earnest desire of all that as an expression of their mutual fellowship and neighbourliness, nothing shall be allowed to be done which might tend to hurt the religious susceptibilities of any one of them, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED that as a vital contribution towards the establishment and maintenance of an atmosphere of Peace, Amity, Concord and mutual Respect and Regard, the communities accustomed to offering animal sacrifices shall, during the life of this Treaty, scrupulously exclude the cow from such offerings.

Whereas further it is customary with certain communities that are used to non-vegetarian diet to include in it beef as an article of food, and whereas for the foregoing reasons and with a view to securing the same end, it is the general:

desire of all that cow-slaughter shall, during the life of this Treaty, be discontinued even with the self-imposed denial of an age-old dietary, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED that, during the life of this Treaty, the slaughter of cows for purposes of food shall be discontinued by directions to be issued by the Muslims of each locality to the local Muslim butchers, throughout the country: Such directions, however, shall in no way affect the undisturbed use, by those who desire it, of canned beef imported from abroad, provided it is ensured that the use of such canned food is not made ostentatiously and in such manner as might hurt men's susceptibilities thereby defeating the object and the spirit underlying this Voluntary Agreement of Amity and Concord..

In the event of the Muslim Doctors and Divines rejecting the suggestions made towards the end of Chapter 4, Part III, of "THE INDIA CHARTER," and deciding upon the maintenance of the status quo, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED as under:—

- (1) that the Hindus admit that Islam enjoins on the Muslims the performance of animal sacrifice including cow sacrifice, and the partaking of animal flesh including cow flesh as an article of food: that in offering such sacrifice and using beef as part of their food the Muslims are within their rights, and that the Hindus shall in no way interfere with the performance of such rites by the Muslims in accordance with the injunctions in their Holy Scriptures: or with the use by them of beef as an article of their food:
- (2) that the Muslims on their part recognise the cow as an object of veneration to the Hindus, and that its slaughter, either for purposes of sacrifice or for food, would hurt the religious susceptibilities of the Hindus: and the Muslims hereby undertake to ensure that in performing such sacrifice scrupulous care shall invariably be taken to ensure that it is done unostentatiously, that animals intended for sacrifice shall not be taken out in processions and that nothing shall be allowed to be done, or left undone, that might directly or indirectly tend to hurt the feelings of the Hindus: it is further agreed that where beef is used for purposes of food, care shall be taken to ensure that it is not exhibited publicly in Hindu localities, nor so otherwise handled as to hurt the feelings of the Hindus."

(b) The Azan — The Muslim Call to Prayer

"That whereas instances have occurred in the past where the Hindus of certain places have raised objections to the recital by their Muslim neighbours of the Muslim Call to Prayer known as the AZAN, and whereas the Hindus are satisfied that the text of the Azan contains nothing that may tend to prove harmful to their religious beliefs and susceptibilities, and whereas it is the earnest desire of the Hindus that the relations between the two communities should be placed firmly on foundations of mutual goodwill and harmonious and amicable neighbourliness, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED that the Hindus shall, on no account whatever, do, or omit to do, anything which might tend to interfere with the free and undisturbed recital of the AZAN by the Muslims in accordance with the requirements of their religion and their customary rites."

(c) Music Before Mosques

"That in cases where communities have hitherto been accustomed to take out in public streets communal processions, or family parties, or other gatherings, on religious, ceremonial, or other occasions such as religious or:

communal festivals, weddings, funerals, etc., such processions, etc., according to the prevailing custom and usage, being accompanied by music, either vocal or instrumental, individual or collective, or being accompanied by the utterance of cries or slogans, repeated individually or collectively, or by delivery of harangues, use of gestures or mimetic representation, exhibition or dissemination of pictures, symbols or placards, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED, without prejudice to the legal rights, if any, of the parties concerned, and as a token of mutual goodwill and harmonious and amicable neighbourliness, that where the route of such procession, etc., lies past a place of worship of any other community, the repeating of slogans, etc., or the singing or playing of music, shall voluntarily be stopped over a distance of one hundred yards while approaching the place of worship, and for a further one hundred yards after passing the place of worship: and that due decorum and silence shall voluntarily be observed by the processionists over the above distance of two hundred yards as a mark of the respect due to all places of worship.

That where to local circumstances do not permit of the above distances being observed to their full extent, such lesser distances as may be feasible shall be determined and adopted by the communities concerned by mutual agreement, and in consultation with and with the approval of the authorities of the place of worship concerned.

That where such distances cannot be determined by the communities concerned by agreement between themselves, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED that in such cases both the communities shall jointly approach the local government authorities to fix such distances, and such decision shall be accepted by both the sides.

THAT IT IS HEREBY FURTHER AGREED VOLUNTARILY that during the life of the Treaty, which shall be 25 years to start with and renewable for further periods by mutual agreement, it shall be the duty of acknowledged local elders of the community to which the processionists belong, to accompany the procession throughout its passage through the public street concerned with a view to ensuring that this Agreement is duly carried out by the processionists both in the letter and in the spirit: It shall likewise be the duty of the acknowledged local elders of the community to which belongs the place of worship situated in the street in question, that they shall remain present in the place of worship, along with the authorities of the place of worship, throughout the time the procession passes over the prescribed distance on either side of the place of worship, with a view to ensuring that those inside the place of worship maintain perfect peace and that nothing untoward is allowed to occur while the procession is passing over the prescribed distance on either side of the place of worship."

(d) The Language Question—Urdu vs. Hindi.

Also, Education and Educational Institutions

"That whereas misunderstanding and differences have been found to exist between the Muslims and the Hindus in certain parts of the Country over the use of the Urdu and Hindi languages, and generally in the matter of Education and Educational Institutions, and whereas both the Hindus and the Muslims are anxious that, in the interests of inter-communal Amity and Concord, all grounds for differences and misunderstanding shall be removed forthwith, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED that the use of these

languages in public institutions, such as, schools, law-courts, and public offices, etc., and the matters pertaining to Education and Educational institutions referred to below, shall, as a rule, be regulated on the following lines:—

- (i) that Urdu shall invariably be included as one of the mediums for imparting education, side by side with other mediums, in all schools run by local bodies:
- (ii) that Urdu schools shall invariably and automatically be opened by local bodies wherever the number of Muslim children of school-going age justifies the establishment of such schools:

Where the number of Muslim children does not justify the opening of separate Urdu schools, it shall be arranged that at the local schools one or more Urdu-knowing teachers as may be necessary and available are included in the school-staff whose duty it would be to impart education to the Muslim children in their own mother tongue, namely, Urdu:

The municipal and local boards as also the provincial governments shall encourage the employment of Urdu-knowing teachers on school staffs by offering special pay or such other inducements to secure an adequate in-flow of such qualified teachers as would be sufficient to meet the local requirements:

Where the number of Muslim children of school-going age is not sufficient to justify the opening of an Urdu school, if in such a case there happens to be no general school available in the neighbourhood where these children could go and where instruction in Urdu could be imparted to them under the above arrangement, the Mullah of the local mosque should be entrusted with the primary education of the local Muslim children, remunerated by a suitable grant from the local body concerned: such Mullahs should with suitable scholarships be encouraged to receive a course of training at the district or provincial Training School for Teachers:

The above arrangement proposed in the case of Muslims shall, in similar circumstances, apply, *mutatis mutandis*, in the case of Hindus as well, Hindi being substituted for Urdu, the temple for the mosque, and the Brahman or the Pundit for the Mullah:

- (iii) that with a view to maintaining the secular character of education and in order to secure that all suggestion of religious discrimination should be scrupulously eliminated from all educational institutions, no religious instruction whatever, whether to Hindu students or Muslim students, shall be imparted at any school maintained from public funds: if the Hindus or the Muslims desire that religious instruction should be imparted to their children, it shall be arranged for by them at their own mandirs or mosques through their brahmins or pundits or moulavis or mullahs, such instruction having no connection whatever with the schools maintained from the public funds:

Similarly, prayers shall be entirely eliminated from the school curriculum in all schools maintained from the public funds:

that in the matter of salutations, the Muslim and Hindu students, at the schools maintained from the public funds, shall be at liberty to

follow their own respective forms of salutation, if they so desire: there shall be no restriction of any kind as to the form to be used: Muslim students shall be free to use either the Muslim or the Hindu form: similarly, Hindu students shall be free to use either Hindu or the Muslim form:

- (iv) that grants-in-aid from the public funds to educational institutions shall be made without discrimination on communal lines, and wholly on the basis of equality between the communities, the only guiding considerations being

- (1) that the children of all the communities shall have equal opportunities and equal facilities for acquiring education: and
- (2) that the need of primary education shall invariably have precedence over those of secondary and higher education:

the withdrawal of grants from schools in favour of a communal college would be a measure that could be supported on no ground whatever:

- (v) that where selection committees exist for the selection of students for admission to educational institutions, adequate Muslim representation thereon shall invariably be provided:

that where any such selection committees have been abolished, they shall be set up again to ensure that the Muslims have a fair share of admissions to the institutions:

- (vi) that while amalgamation of special schools with general schools may be justifiable on economic grounds, such amalgamation shall, in the general interests, be restricted to non-Muslim special schools: that all Moplah and other Muslim schools closed so far shall be re-opened within a specified time: and that no Moplah and other Muslim schools shall be closed on any grounds except with the consent of the local Muslim community:

- (vii) that it is essential and desirable that education among backward people, such as the Moplahs, shall be encouraged and advanced and not retarded: that in the case of the Moplahs, since the abolition of the posts of Conductors and Conductresses in Moplah schools has resulted in a fall in the number of Moplah pupils, especially girls, these posts shall be revived as a special case in the special circumstances of the Moplah community: for the same reason the posts of Arabic Pundits which have been abolished shall be revived; and it shall be ensured that during the life of this Treaty, as a matter of general policy, no posts of Conductors, Conductresses, and Arabic Pundits shall be reduced, and at the same time steps shall be taken by the District Local Boards concerned, with such financial assistance from their Local Government as may be necessary, to accelerate the pace of education among the Moplah Community to enable it to be sufficiently equipped educationally, to be able to take its rightful share in the affairs of the District along with the other communities:

- (viii) that in the matter of the award of scholarships, free studentships, etc., available at educational institutions, the guiding principles shall invariably be

- (1) that there shall be no discrimination on communal grounds:
- (2) that all benefits shall be distributed between the communities evenly:
- (ix) that as regards the Viddia Mandir Scheme wherever adopted, the following arrangement shall apply in the case of Muslims:—
 - (1) the minimum number of children required for such a school shall be reduced in the case of Muslims to 15 or such other figure as may be determined by the local authorities in consultation with the local Muslims:
 - (2) such schools for the Muslims shall be called Maktabas or Maddressahs, not Viddia Mandirs:
 - (3) if the number of Muslim children does not come up to the above minimum, arrangements for their instruction shall be provided through the local Mullah:
- (x) that text-books shall be revised or re-written with a view to ensuring that the complaint regarding unequal treatment in the matter of references to divinities, saints, heroes, etc., of the two communities is eliminated and that such references in all text-books shall be given on a footing of equality thus doing equal justice to both the communities:
- (xi) that applications written in Urdu shall in no case be rejected: arrangements shall invariably be made by all bodies for dealing with such applications and for replies being sent out in Urdu:
- (xii) that all courts shall make adequate arrangements for dealing with documents written in the Urdu script and that copies in the Hindi script shall not be insisted upon:
- (xiii) that adequate arrangements shall invariably be made in all Legislatures for reporting Urdu speeches in the Urdu script."

(e) The National Anthem

"That whereas misunderstanding has been found to exist between the Muslims and the Hindus in certain parts of the Country over the use, at mixed gatherings, of certain songs by certain sections of the public, and whereas both the Hindus and the Muslims are anxious that in the interests of inter-communal Amity and Concord all grounds for misunderstanding shall be removed forthwith, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED that when the Country has secured Freedom, the Government of Free India shall set up a representative committee to arrange to have a National Anthem composed for All-India: and that until such time as an Anthem comes to be adopted by common agreement,

- (1) no communal or sectional song, such as the Bande Mataram, etc., shall be sung at mixed gatherings:

- (2) in place of a song, the following Solemn Affirmation shall be repeated at all gatherings :—

“WE SOLEMNLY REAFFIRM OUR FIRM RESOLVE,
UNBENDING WILL, AND INFLEXIBLE DETERMINATION,
TO WIN FREEDOM FOR OUR COUNTRY.
THROUGH DISTRUST AND DISUNITY WE HAVE BEEN RESPONSIBLE
FOR PROLONGING THE BONDAGE OF OUR COUNTRY.
WE ARE DETERMINED TO TRUST OUR BROTHERS.
UNITEDLY WE SHALL STRIVE FOR FREEDOM:
UNITEDLY WE SHALL WIN FREEDOM.
WE SOLEMNLY PLEDGE OURSELVES BEFORE GOD
WE SHALL NOT REST TILL WE HAVE WON FREEDOM.
SO HELP US GOD!
LONG LIVE OUR INDIA.”

(f) The National Flag

“That whereas misunderstanding has been found to exist between the Muslims and the Hindus in certain parts of the Country over the use, at mixed gatherings, of certain Flags by certain sections of the public, and whereas both the Muslims and the Hindus are anxious that, in the interests of inter-communal Amity and Concord, all grounds for misunderstanding shall be removed forthwith, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED as under:—

that when the Country has secured Freedom, the Government of Free India shall set up a representative committee to evolve an agreed National Flag for all India, and that till then

- (1) the Indian States shall be free to continue to use their own Flags:
- (2) in the British India Provinces, no communal, sectional or party Flag, such as the Congress, League, or Sabha Flags, shall be used under any circumstances whatsoever.”

(g) Inter-Communal Social Intercourse

“That whereas in the social intercourse between the Muslims and the Hindus it has been observed that certain aspects of such intercourse have proved unsatisfactory to the Muslims, that while it is recognised that there is no ill-feeling on the part of the Hindus in their treatment of the Muslims to which the latter have taken exception, and that whereas it is the common wish of both the Hindus and the Muslims that, in the interests of inter-communal Amity and Concord, all ground for dissatisfaction between the communities on this score shall be removed forthwith, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED that in their future intercourse the two communities shall adopt the following SOLEMN AFFIRMATIONS as their respective guides:—

- (1) By the Hindus—

“We Hindus solemnly affirm that in our social intercourse with our Muslim neighbours we shall endeavour to the best of our ability

invariably to treat them as our brothers as we would expect them to treat us as their brothers: and we shall honestly endeavour that in our intercourse with them we do not say or do anything, advertently or inadvertently, that may directly or indirectly injure their feelings in any way:

(2) By the Muslims—

‘We Muslims readily accept the assurances of fellowships offered by our Hindu brothers: henceforth we shall be brothers to them as we expect them to be brothers to us: and may Allah bless our Brotherhood.’

(h) Maintenance of Law and Order

“That whereas it has been the general experience that due to an unfortunate lack of education among the masses and their regrettable tendency to give a communal colour to whatever differences may happen to arise between the two communities, such differences in the past have given rise to communal disturbances involving breaches of the public peace resulting in damage to property and loss of life, and whereas it is the earnest desire of both the Muslims and the Hindus that steps should be taken and means provided to ensure that the occurrence of such disturbances hereafter shall be reduced to the minimum, and that mutually agreed means shall be provided and measures taken for the prevention and control of disturbances, IT IS HEREBY VOLUNTARILY AGREED between the Hindus and the Muslims that, in the interests of inter-communal Amity and Concord, the following measures shall be adopted all over the Country, with the co-operation of the local authorities wherever necessary:—

(1) Registration of Bad Characters—

Up-to-date registers shall be maintained with village patels and at all police thanas: whenever an important holiday of either the Hindus or the Muslims approaches, all the local goondas on the register shall be taken into custody at least a week before the commencement of the holiday and detained in custody upto a week after the holiday has passed:

(2) Maintenance of Order—

The Muslim and the Hindu residents of every village, and of every street or quarter of a town, shall be required to set up standing committees of local Leaders, about five in number for each community, who shall be held responsible for the maintenance of order in their respective localities at all times, particularly at times of holidays, religious festivals, etc. If the Hindu and Muslim committees of a locality, on any occasion, undertake to hold themselves jointly responsible for the maintenance of order in their locality, the local magistrate shall formally bind down both the committees to maintain peace and order, and issue a proclamation to that effect, and the local police shall thereupon restrict themselves to supervisory duties only. If the Hindu and Muslim committees of a locality are unable to reach an understanding as above, they shall report the fact to the local magistrate who shall, besides binding down both the committees as above, promptly have the local goondas and bad characters taken into custody, impose curfew, and issue suitable orders under section

144 of the Criminal Procedure Code and the appropriate section of the Provincial Police Act corresponding to section 34 of the Bombay District Police Act: these measures shall remain in force for such period as the magistrate may fix at his discretion:

in distant parts of the country where there may be no local magistrate available on the spot, every magistrate in the neighbourhood shall issue suitable orders on the above lines, on his own initiative, throughout his own jurisdiction.

{3} Processions

No procession shall be allowed to be taken out at any time without a license from the magistrate of the locality, who, before issuing a license shall bind down for good behaviour all the declared organisers of the procession for the period of a week before and a week after the date of the procession. The time of the procession and the route to be followed shall be subject to the prior approval of the local magistrate who shall similarly bind down for good behaviour the leading residents of either community along the route of the procession. In addition to the above measures, the magistrate shall also place under detention all the local goondas and bad characters for such period as he may determine at his discretion. These measures shall be adopted in addition to the voluntary arrangements provided above in respect of Music before Mosques:

{4} Breaches of the Peace

Whenever any damage is caused to any property as a result of rioting or other disturbance of the public peace, it shall be dealt with on the following lines:—

- (i) the determination of the responsibility for the breach and liability therefor at law shall be a matter for the law courts:
- (ii) the machinery of the law shall be set in motion only in cases where the breach has resulted in loss of life:
- (iii) in the case of personal injuries, compensation shall be determined and paid as provided below in the case of damage to property:
- (iv) the extent of the damage caused to Hindu property and the Muslim property shall be determined separately by the Hindu and Muslim Local Committees of the locality (vide clause (h) (2) above) by joint consultations, and the amounts payable as compensation in each case shall also be determined by the above committees jointly:
- (v) as regards the damage caused to Muslim property, the same shall be made good by the Hindu residents of the locality, in cash or in kind, at the option of the persons affected by the damage: similarly, in the case of damage done to Hindu property, the same shall be made good by the Muslim residents of the locality, in cash or in kind, at the option of the persons affected by the damage:
- (vi) the amount of compensation, payable as per the foregoing clause, by the residents of the locality, Muslim or Hindu

as the case may be, shall be raised as may be determined by the local committee of the community to which the persons liable to pay belong.

NOTE As regards the Local Committees referred to in Clause (4) above, these shall, as far as possible, be constituted on the following lines:—

The Committee shall be composed of five men in each village and in each quarter of a township, as under:—

2 Muslims

2 Hindus

1 Non-Muslim-Hindu, who shall be the SUR-PUNCH.

As regards the SUR-PUNCH, where a Non-Muslim-Hindu is not available, the Muslim and Hindu members shall, unanimously or by a majority of votes, select a person to be their SUR-PUNCH (whether he is a Hindu or a Muslim shall be immaterial).

As regards the election of the Muslim and Hindu members of the Committee, the following procedure shall be adopted:—

- (a) Of the two Muslims, one shall be elected by the Muslims of the locality, the other by the Hindus of the locality: Similarly, of the two Hindus one shall be elected by the Hindus of the locality, the other by the Muslims of the locality:

In localities where Caste-Hindus and Non-Caste Hindus are in equal or large proportions, the two Hindu members shall comprise

(i) a Caste Hindu

(ii) a non-Caste Hindu

The non-Caste member shall be elected by all the Hindus jointly: The Caste-Hindu shall be elected by the Muslims.

- or, (b) The Muslim members shall be elected by the Muslims of the locality: As regards the Hindu members, in localities where Caste Hindus and non-Caste Hindus are in equal or large proportions, the members shall comprise

(i) a Caste Hindu

(ii) a non-Caste Hindu

the Caste member shall be elected by the Caste Hindus;

the non-Caste member shall be elected by the non-Caste Hindus.

The arrangement in Clause (a) is suggested with a view to fostering mutual confidence, and may be adopted if the Caste and non-Caste Hindus and the Muslims of a locality decide in its favour by common consent. Where such agreement is not forthcoming, the arrangement to be adopted shall be as per Clause (b).

C — M A N D A T E
TO THE
FIRST FEDERAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ON THE PRINCIPLES OF A
TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP
BETWEEN
UNITED INDIA AND BRITAIN

It shall be the first task of the First Federal House of Representatives and Government to evolve a TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP with Britain providing for the future relations of United India with Britain on the general principles outlined below.

TREATY WITH BRITAIN

Life of the treaty

—20 years.

Fiscal Relations

—As an autonomous State, United India shall have the power to formulate her own Fiscal Policy unfettered by any restrictions.

United India shall have the unrestricted power to impose such taxation on Indian nationals, nationals of the British Empire, and other foreigners, as she may deem fit.

Commerce

—United India shall have the unrestricted right to adopt any Tariff that may be dictated by her interests against any State, including the States comprising the British Empire, with the only exception that in the case of Great Britain all Indian Tariffs shall allow her a Preference to the extent of a percentage to be fixed. This Preference shall be irrespective of whether it is reciprocated by Great Britain or not. The Preference, however, shall not apply to the Dominions comprised in the British Empire unless specifically so provided.

Financial Commitments

—All existing financial obligations incurred by the British Government in India, or elsewhere on behalf of India, whether they may be demonstrably in India's interests, or not, shall be taken over by United India and duly honoured. They shall collectively form the National Debt of Honour assumed by the Federal Government with the inauguration of the Federation: if any class or classes of India's revenues stand assigned specifically against any existing debts, such individual assignments shall stand released on the assumption of the collective National Debt by the Federal Government. This assumption shall in no way involve the control, in any shape or form, of the Creditor Power over the unrestricted disposal of its revenues by United India in exercise of its sovereign authority.

All existing investments in India, either by the British Government or by British nationals, shall be duly protected by United India, and shall not be subjected to any disabilities or discriminatory treatment in the matter of taxation, etc.

International Agreements

and obligations—Such International Agreements and Obligations made and undertaken by the British Government in the name of India, as may be operative at the date of this Treaty, shall be taken over and honoured by United India.

Entry into and movement

within United India—United India shall have the unrestricted power to exclude, or admit, any person of nationality other than Indian, from or within her territories, and no non-Indian shall be eligible to acquire landed property within her territories except under a license to be issued under the authority of the Federal Government.

Military Assistance

—With a view to enabling United India to enter upon her autonomous career with a nucleus of land, sea, and air armaments sufficient for her immediate defence requirements, Britain shall sell to her the necessary units of such armaments, such as, guns including anti-aircraft guns, armoured cars, tanks, warplanes including fighters, bombers and all-duty planes and warships including cruisers, destroyers, aircraft tenders, submarines, etc. These units shall immediately be formally made over to United India. Until such time as the necessary trained Indian personnel becomes available, the existing British personnel manning the units shall remain with the units, their cost being met by United India, such personnel being repatriated to Britain in course of time as it becomes feasible to replace them with corresponding Indian personnel.

With the same end in view and as part of the same arrangement, Britain shall assist United India in establishing armament factories capable of manufacturing all modern armaments including factories capable of manufacturing modern guns, tanks, etc., and warplanes: also in constructing naval yards and dockyards capable of building modern ships including warships.

Britain shall likewise assist United India in training Indians both in the construction and handling of modern plants, and manufacture of machinery of peace and war: as also in the art of operating such war machines by setting up such fully equipped training institutions adequately manned with expert staff.

The cost of such armaments as Britain may sell to United India under this Clause shall be deemed to be a part of United India's National Debt repayable within a specified period with interest at a specified

rate: as mentioned above, no class of United India's revenues shall be specifically assigned against such Debt.

Political

—Britain and United India shall undertake that during the life of the Treaty, if one of the parties becomes engaged in war with a third party, the other party, if it does not join the first party, shall in no event join the third party, but maintain strict neutrality. For instance, if Britain goes to war with any Power, if United India does not join Britain, she shall not join the Power with whom Britain is at war.

War

—Provisions to the following effect in respect of the present World War shall be included in the Treaty:—

that should the War have been concluded, and should the Peace following upon the conclusion of the war have been signed, before the new Federal Constitution for United India became operative, it shall be deemed to have been accepted between the parties, namely, Britain and United India, that the terms of such Treaty, in so far as they tend to affect United India, shall be deemed to be operative vis-a-vis United India only to the following extent:—

(a) that inasmuch as duly constituted plenipotentiaries of United India were not parties to the conclusion of the Treaty, the said Treaty shall be deemed to be inoperative so far as United India is concerned:

(b) that if such Treaty carried any terms imposing any liability upon the territories comprising United India, such liability shall be deemed wholly and solely to attach to the British Government irrespective of and without any reference to the territories of United India:

(c) that if any agreements made and any arrangements undertaken on behalf of India under the above Treaty are deemed by the Federal Government of United India to be demonstrably in the interests of United India, it shall be open to the Federal Government to adopt such agreements and undertakings:

(d) that in respect of such matters affecting the territories of United India as may have been dealt with in the said Treaty, but which have not been adopted by the Federal Government of United India under the foregoing clause, it shall be open to the Federal Government of United India.

to conclude the necessary agreements and arrangements with the Powers concerned, direct, in her own sovereign right:

- (e) that the British Government undertake that if under the said Treaty they become the recipients of any indemnities from the vanquished States, an equitable share of such indemnities as may be determined to be due to this Country proportionate to her contributions towards fighting and winning the War both in men, material, and in other shapes and forms, shall be duly paid to her:

Provided that

- (f) in the event of the War being concluded before the new Federal Constitution for United India became operative, if the procedure outlined in the Section headed 'PRINCIPLES' be adopted, the Federal Government of United India shall take cognisance of the PEACE TREATY and may either

- (i) ratify it in toto, or

- (ii) subject to amendments, or

- (iii) reject it.

In the last case, the provisions of the foregoing Clauses (a) to (e) shall be deemed to have become operative.

THAT SHALL BE PROVIDED FOR IN THE CONSTITUTION:

Renunciation by certain Communities

The following Declaration of Voluntary Renunciation by certain Communities shall be incorporated in the Constitution:—

“We, the Sikhs, the Anglo Indians, the Indian Christians, and the Parsees of UNITED INDIA hereby declare that we are convinced that for the solidarity of the Country it is essential that in its future Constitution the Muslim and the Hindu Communities should be placed on a footing of EQUALITY between themselves in all respects, including numerical equality on Local Bodies, Legislatures and Ministries, thereby enabling them to decide all questions of administration, policy, etc., freely, as between equals. We realise that to secure this end it would be essential that while discussion should be open to the members of all communities represented on those Bodies, the decision should in all cases be restricted to the members of the Muslim and Hindu communities alone, the members of the other communities scrupulously refraining from exercising their vote. We recognise that such non-exercise of the vote would amount to the sacrifice of a valuable right: but we feel that such sacrifice is called for from us in the larger interests of the Country and in ensuring its solidarity through inter-communal peace and harmony.

As a token of our goodwill towards our sister communities, and as our humble contribution in the cause of our Country, we hereby solemnly declare that, during the currency of the arrangement envisaged in “THE INDIA CHARTER,” our representatives on Local Bodies, Legislatures and Ministries, while giving their colleagues the fullest benefit of their advice at all times and on all occasions, shall scrupulously and absolutely refrain from exercising their vote on all matters coming before those Bodies under any and all circumstances.”

Communal Electorates

The Constitution shall provide that for a period of 20 years from the date of the inauguration of the Constitution of United India, the principle of Communal Electorates shall be retained, and Electorates, both for Provincial, States and Federal Legislatures, as also for Local Bodies, shall be constituted as under:—

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| (a) Caste Hindus | (e) Sikhs |
| (b) Non-Caste Hindus | (f) Indian Christians |
| (c) Muslims—Upper Classes | (g) Anglo-Indians |
| (d) Muslims—Lower Classes | (h) Parsees |

At the end of the above period, it shall be open to the Federal House of Representatives, in consultation with the Provincial and States Houses, to examine this provision, and either to renew it for any further term, or to replace it by the system of Joint Electorates, or to adopt any other arrangement as may then be decided upon.

Communal Representation

The Communal Representation on Local Bodies and Provincial (except Punjab) and States Legislatures, shall, for a period of 20 years from the date of the inauguration of the Constitution, be governed by the following proportions :—

MUSLIMS		HINDUS	
50%		50%	
UPPER CLASSES	LOWER CLASSES	CASTE HINDUS	NON-CASTE HINDUS
25%	25%	25%	25%

The members returned by the above Communities shall be voting members. In addition to these, there shall be elected to all Bodies, by their respective communal electorates, such number of members from the Sikh, Anglo-Indian, Indian Christian and Parsee Communities as may be determined in the case of such Bodies, such members serving on such Bodies as Advisors, with all the rights and privileges of membership except the right to vote.

As regards the Punjab, should it choose to join the Federation, the representation shall be as under:—

MUSLIMS		HINDUS		SIKHS	OTHERS
48%		24%		24%	4%
UPPER CLASSES	LOWER CLASSES	CASTE	NON-CASTE		
24%	24%	12%	12%		
VOTING		MEMBERS		NON-VOTING MEMBERS	

As regards representation on the Federal House of Representatives, this shall be as provided for under the Section headed Constitution.

Communal Proportion in Services

Recruitment to the Services shall, for a period of 20 years from the date of the inauguration of the Constitution, be in the following proportions except in the Punjab and the Federal Services:—

IN THE PUNJAB AND THE FEDERAL SERVICES)	MUSLIMS	—	UPPER CLASSES	20%
	"	—	LOWER "	20%
	HINDUS	—	CASTE	20%
	"	—	NON-CASTE	20%
	OTHERS			20%
	MUSLIMS	—	UPPER CLASSES	22%
	"	—	LOWER "	22%
	HINDUS	—	CASTE	11%
	"	—	NON-CASTE	11%
	SIKHS			22%
	OTHERS			12%

The above arrangement shall be subject to renewal or revision, at the end of the above period, by consultation between the Federal, Provincial and State Legislatures.

THE STATES

Administration

—The Rulers shall agree to place the administration of the States in line with the administration in the Provinces.

State-Groups and

Sub-Groups—For the purposes of administrative convenience, the Chamber of Princes shall, in consultation with the All-India States Subjects Conference or other representative Body of State Subjects, evolve a suitable Grouping of the States into Sub-Groups, if such grouping is not in existence already, which may facilitate the maintenance of administrative services common to each sub-group.

In addition to the above grouping for the above purpose, each combination constituting a sub-group as stated above, a further grouping shall be evolved, grouping the sub-groups into a smaller number of large groups, with the object of facilitating voting arrangements for the election of representatives to the Federal House. The number of such groups shall correspond to the total number of Provinces that join the Federation of United India either as Primary or Acceding Members, the total number of voting seats in the Federal House being divided equally between the Province-Members and the State-Members, as shown in Section 7—CONSTITUTION where the arrangement shown provides for the distribution of the 176 voting seats between 11 Provinces and 11 State-Groups on the basis of allotment of 8 seats to each Province and each State Member.

In regard to the Local Bodies which the States shall set up to suit local circumstances and meet local requirements, the necessary local communal electorates shall be set up on the basis of Adult Franchise as Provided elsewhere in this Part. The same electorates shall elect representatives to the State Legislatures that shall be set up either in individual States where the State's size and resources permit of this being done, or for such State-Groups as may be evolved for the purpose.

Electoral Colleges

—The Chamber of Princes shall constitute the Electoral College for the election of Princes to the Federal House of Representatives.

As regards the election of representatives of the States Subjects, electoral rolls shall be prepared on the basis of Adult Franchise, and elections held, on the lines obtaining in other parts of United India: until such time such electorates are constituted, the All-India States Subjects Conference, or any other similar Body, shall be accepted as representative of the States Subjects.

*States' Treaties with the
Paramount Power*

—For the first 20 years of the life of the Federation and during such further period as the States continue to be members of the Federation, their Treaties with the British Crown shall be deemed to be held in abeyance: and they shall be deemed to be revived on the States ceasing to be members of the Federation. In the case of continued membership, the Treaties shall be deemed to have lapsed at the end of 50 years from the date of the inauguration of the Constitution of United India.

During the period of such membership, any contributions in the nature of tribute which the States may be required under their Treaties to make to the Paramount Power shall be deemed to be payable to the Federal Government: such amounts shall, however, be allowed to remain with the State concerned subject to the understanding that the amounts are utilised by the State Authorities in providing education, sanitation, and medical relief for the subjects of the State. In case the Treaties come to be revived any time, such payments, from the date of the revival of the Treaties, shall become payable to the Paramount Power as provided therein.

- Laws* —The laws of the States shall be brought in line with the laws of the other parts of United India.
- Privy Purse* —The Princes shall voluntarily agree in the principle of a fixed Privy Purse.
- Rights of Subjects* —The States Subjects shall be entitled to freedom of speech, association, religious observances, and such other rights as are enjoyed by the people in other parts of United India.
- The Press* —The Press in the States shall enjoy the same measure of freedom, subject to the same safeguards, if any, as obtain in other parts of United India.
- Taxation* —In the matter of taxation, the Rulers shall ensure that their subjects are not subjected to harder conditions than those prevailing in other parts of United India.
- Customs, Excise, etc.* —In the matter of Customs, Excise, etc., the States shall follow a policy of co-operation in conformity with a common policy that may come to be evolved for United India by the Federal House.

Representative

Institutions—In the matter of establishment of representative institutions, responsible government, civil liberties, and method of election to the Federal House, the States shall approximate to the other parts of United India.

Breakdown—In the event of a breakdown of the Federal Constitution for any reason, if such breakdown is not repaired within a fixed period, the Princes' powers that were transferred to the Federation under the Constitution shall revert to the Princes, and the *status quo ante transfer* shall be deemed to have been restored. If such breakdown occurs within a period of 50 years from the date of the inauguration of the Constitution within which the States' Treaties with the Paramount Power would under the Constitution have remained in suspension, such Treaties shall, on such breakdown, be deemed to have been revived and become operative automatically as between the States and the Paramount Power. If such breakdown occurs after the lapse of 50 years from the above date, in that case, since the States' Treaties with the Paramount Power would have lapsed the States shall resume their full untrammelled sovereign identity vis-a-vis the world.

Dominion Status

When the Federal Constitution has been framed by the Constitution-Making Body, when it has been adopted by the Provinces designated therein as Primary Members, namely, the Provinces of Bihar, United Provinces, Assam, Orissa, Madras, Bombay, and the Central Provinces and the Berars, and when the Constitution has been passed by the British Parliament, steps shall be taken for the election of the First Federal House of Representatives.

This election shall be held on the sole issue of the political status of United India,

(1) whether it shall be an Independent Sovereign State in the fullest sense of the term: or,

(2) whether it shall be a Dominion in the British Commonwealth.

The issue shall be decided by the Federal House by a three-fourths majority. If the House is divided otherwise, it shall be adjourned for a few weeks to enable the members to consult their constituencies: If a clear three-fourths majority is still not forth-coming, the House shall stand dissolved and fresh elections held to enable the Country to issue a fresh mandate to its representatives.

When the Federal House has taken a decision on the question of Status, the House shall proceed to take the next step, namely, the negotiation of a Treaty with Britain on the lines indicated in the Section under the head 'Treaty with Britain.'

In case the decision happens to be in favour of Dominion Status, the Treaty terms as given in the above Section shall be adopted with such variations as may be found to be necessary to fit them into the structure of the British Commonwealth: for instance, the provision regarding the Council of Five shall have to be replaced by one providing for a Governor-General as in the other Dominions: likewise, the office of the Secretary of State for India shall be abolished, the affairs of the Dominion of United India being taken over by Britain's Dominions Office.

All the rest of the structure of this Plan, e. g., the Inter-Communal Treaty, the Maxims, the Principles, the Fundamentals, the Essentials, and the Constitution based thereon, as also the Treaty with Britain as outlined herein, shall hold good under the Dominion Constitution.

The above procedure shall hold both in case the Muslims and the Princes join United India, as also in case they decide to stand out.

In the latter case, the question of a Constitution for Pakistan, and for the Princes, will be a matter for them to arrange for themselves. It is beyond the aim and scope of this work, and consequently it makes no attempt to tackle the question.

“INTO THY HANDS, AHURA MAZDA, WE COMMIT OURSELVES.
LET THY GUIDING HAND LEAD OUR LIVES.
TEACH US TO LIVE AS COMRADES ALL,
IN WILLING FELLOWSHIP AND LOVING FRATERNITY,
IN BROTHERLY HELPFULNESS AND CO-OPERATION.
INSPIRE US TO LIVE
IN MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND TRUST AND PEACE.”

PART—VI
TO THOSE CONCERNED

CHAPTER I

TO OUR BRITISH RULERS

"We are trying within the Empire to foster the creation of a United India, sufficiently at one within herself in respect of those fundamentals on which every nation-State must rest, that we may devolve upon her people the power for the control of their own affairs, and the ordering of their own political life. And if the issue of what we seek to do is to reflect our aim truly and endure, this unity, at once the condition and criterion of success, must evoke not only the respect but the loyalty of an India, content and proud to realise its full destiny through imperial partnership."

(Lord Irwin, Lecture at Toronto University, 1932)*

GENTLEMEN.

When I started compiling this work. I had no intention of addressing you. I had intended to address myself to my countrymen alone. They are the parties principally. I may even say, solely, interested in and concerned with the fate of this country, your interest and concern appearing, to the Indian eye, to be indistinguishable from those of a bird of passage that is here today and gone tomorrow, its sole interest, concern and anxiety apparently being that it should be assured of ample feed during its stay in the land of its sojourn. Even so, as I progressed with the work, I have felt that it is due to you that you should be enabled to know exactly how you stand today in the eyes of Indians in general. I do not propose to write a commentary on British rule, or un-British rule, in India. History will speak for itself. I shall only attempt to speak of the immediate present. Throughout this work which is intended for and addressed to my countrymen, you will have observed I have been plain-spoken and direct. It would be less than fair to you if I did otherwise with you gentlemen. You are capable of forming your own judgment. I shall leave you to form it for yourselves.

I am aware that you claim to be here as Trustees for the well-being of the masses of this country. While many of your predecessors through the two centuries of your stay here have felt and declared their faith that having conquered the country by the sword it required to be ruled by the sword, there were others who thought that it would be in their interests and that the object could be equally well served by substituting the pen for the sword. The civilian administrator stepped in as soon as the soldier conqueror had done his job and stepped aside. In due course the Trustee theory was conceived and developed, though, as the authors of the "Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India" have observed, (a) "most Indians live and die without even seeing an Englishman." To the masses it has no significance who rules at Delhi. Most of them have not even heard of Delhi. To them it makes no difference whether Rama rules or Ravana rules at the seat of the mighty. They are blissfully ignorant that they have the good or bad fortune of constituting a Trust for the Britisher! The Indian village system, compact in all respects, has survived while wave after wave of foreign invasions that swept over the country spent itself on India's vast expanses and passed into oblivion. It will survive the upheavals of the future as it has done those of the past. To Indian ears the talk of Trusteeship is meaningless.

* RISE AND FULFILMENT OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA by Edward Thompson and G. T. Garratt, page 597.

(a) Ditto. page 646.

We have known many British administrators who devoted themselves to this country's welfare. Our grateful hearts cherish their memory. They moved among the masses and by their paternal sympathies earned for themselves the honoured and beloved title of "MA-BAP" (Mother-Father). Through them the Government, the Sarkar, came to be known as the MA-BAP of the Raiyats, the People. The MA-BAP tradition sank deep in the minds and hearts of the people of this country. It was a tradition that was worth armies to your administration.

The times, however, changed: the MA-BAP administrators of the early days and their spiritual successors went the way of their fathers: their race appears now to have become extinct.

The time was—not long ago—it was as late as September 1940—when I was old-fashioned enough to have fondly believed that the MA-BAP spirit had only lain dormant—had not been dead—and that it was possible to awaken it in the service of your country as well as mine. In "AN APPEAL TO EUROPEANS IN INDIA" issued in September, 1940 I wrote, *inter alia*,

"With all their short-comings I am an admirer of the great British race, their great traditions, and their great contribution to Civilization. I believe in the fulfilment of India's destiny as a free and equal partner in the great Commonwealth of Nations that we know as the British Empire. I admire Britain for her inspiring stand for Civilization in the greatest conflict the world has seen. There are millions in this ancient land whose hearts are with Britain and who long to share her perils shoulder to shoulder with her. These generous hearts, however, are laden with sorrow and distrust and despair. Their generous impulses are those of a loyal slave towards his benevolent master. Grant them the freedom and equality that are enjoyed by their confreres in the Dominions of the Empire: it will add countless cubits to their moral and political stature, and raise them in the estimation of the world. It would be a tragedy and a calamity if at this critical hour they should any longer be denied the opportunity to take an honourable share in this struggle that is their due. May it be given to your great Community to retrieve the lost ground by holding out to us your hand of comradeship and to restore to this country that trust in your intentions which unhappily appears to have been lost. We cannot afford to hesitate or be content with half measures. We have got to win the war, and win it quickly, for every day of delay in harnessing the maximum of this country's resources must mean so much suffering and the loss of so many precious lives which could be saved by timely and courageous action now." (a)

Again, in an article in *The Daily Gazette of Karachi*, dated the 30th November, 1940 I wrote:—

"Some notable pronouncements affecting the political problem of India have been made in the last few days. H. E. The Viceroy and the Secretary of State for India have re-affirmed that their offer of expansion of the Central Executive Council and the establishment of a War Advisory Council constituted the utmost advance they could contemplate in the political field while the war lasted. Both regretted its rejection by the Congress and the Muslim League, but at the same time emphasised that the door had been left open should these parties happen to change their mind any time. The Mahatma, too, while evolving his plan of Satyagraha, has repeatedly

(a) Extract from my "THE PROBLEM OF INDIA—AN APPEAL TO EUROPEANS IN INDIA" published in THE DAILY GAZETTE, Karachi, dated the 5th September, 1940.

asserted that, so far as the Congress is concerned, the door continues to remain open. So also has the League Leader declared—the door is open.

With all the doors thus open, why is it that the happy re-union is nowhere visible? Why is it that the stalemate still persists?

'I have noticed a marked stiffening of tone on the side of the Government. I have noticed a growing bitterness creeping into the pronouncements of Congress Leaders. The ring of resentment and pique in the League Leader's utterances cannot be missed.

The doors are open, but no indication of a welcome is visible anywhere. The doors remain open, yet no one passes in.

While the parties to the dispute maintain an attitude of sulk, time of course passes on: opportunities have come and gone: the drift continues: the gulf widens: the Congress has launched Satyagraha, a counsel of desperation and despair: arrests have followed: people who have hitherto been busy with war work are looking up inquiringly: they will soon understand: the downward drift has commenced: soon it will gather the volume and force of a torrent: are we sure we shall be able to dam its mad sweep then? Is it not the part of wisdom to stem the tide while yet it is possible to do so?

Who shall make the first move towards a rapprochement?

When children fall out between themselves and with their mother, Nature has ordained that the mother with her mother's love invariably takes the initiative and restores harmony between the little disputants and also helps them to make up with herself, often going out not only half the way but all the way to win them back to her maternal lap. She does so instinctively, but at the same time she also realises that it is her duty to do so in fulfilment of the sacred trust that children are to their parents from God. In spite of all that has happened, to the Indian millions their 'Sarkar' is still their 'MA-BAP.' The 'MA-BAP' tradition has sustained British rule in India for close on two centuries. It is a tradition that has brought honour to the British rule. Can Britons as men of honour stand by and see this venerable tradition extinguished?

The Europeans in India appear to have realised the seriousness of the situation, though unfortunately a little late in the day. The *Times of India* believes 'that the time has come when the British Government must take the initiative and make a positive contribution towards ending the prolonged stalemate'. This is as it should be. The 'MA-BAP' must do their duty however refractory the children may prove to be.

What time the European organ of Bombay was advocating 'a positive contribution by the British Government towards ending the prolonged stalemate,' the Secretary of State for India permitted himself to air views and put forward suggestions anent the Problem which, to say the least, were most unfortunate and definitely harmful. Addressing the English Speaking Union he is reported to have observed,

'Maybe the fears of the Muslims may be largely met by a further increase in the powers of the provinces, possibly re-arranged and re-grouped, subject only to a minimum central control necessary to secure some measure of unity in foreign, defensive and economic policy. A change in that direction would no doubt also largely meet the hesitations of the Princes.'

Have the British Government revised their attitude towards Pakistan? Could one blame the Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha if they see in this statement a bait to the League and the Princes, and an attempt to further widen the gulf now dividing them?

On the same occasion Mr. Amery appears to have also been responsible for the following observation:—

'It is, I believe, for Indians themselves to face these questions and seek a constructive solution. Maybe the lead in such a study will come not so much from the older party leaders but from younger men, who are inspired with a patriotism which puts India first—first not only before subservience to British but also before subservience to party or community.'

In appealing to Youth to take a hand in the game of constitution-building for India, is not the Secretary of State treading dangerous ground? Evidently he does not know Young India. It is no longer an unknown quantity. Have the lessons of the past been forgotten so completely?

I agree that the present leadership both in the League and the Congress has failed lamentably and that a change is overdue. But leaders are not made overnight: nor is the thick of the war the appropriate time to try new, maybe raw, leaders.

But the *Question* remains—*Have the MA-BAP been doing their duty by their children—their refractory children?* A Government with vision would assume the Country's leadership themselves, and lead the Country to contentment and the war to victory. Will Delhi and Whitehall yet manifest this vision?"

There was no sign of the awakening of the spirit, no sign of a responding conscience, noticeable anywhere. Reluctantly, sadly, I felt the conviction grow on me, as it has grown on very many others in this country, that the race of MA-BAP Englishmen had gone for ever.

That of sophisters appears to have filled its place. In the absence of the genuine article, the appeal to the Trustee theory became more frequent, and was pressed upon us with increasing vehemence as the conviction grew upon you that you had lost the place in our hearts that belonged to the MA-BAP of old, and that you were now regarded more and more as strangers, as self-invited guests who had overstayed their welcome.

You assert that as their Trustees the interests of the Indian masses must remain in your safe-keeping: that you alone know what is good for them: that the masses should look to you for their salvation, not to their natural leaders from among their own countrymen. Along with this assertion you made certain promises for their advancement: you placed before them certain goals. Our people feel your promises have remained unimplemented: that the goals have still remained goals only, as distant as ever. Your present Prime Minister has told them that "Dominion Status is a distant, remote goal which it is not practicable to take into consideration in any period which human beings need take account of"! Not being versed in your conception of politics, our people have come to lose faith in your promises—in your *bona fides*.

The time was when we Indians had believed there was honest statesmanship still left among the present generation of Britishers in whose hands an inscrutable Providence had placed the destinies of this country. We have now grown to realise that honest statesmanship no longer exists in England.

You talk of lack of unity amongst us and of the resultant Deadlock. That a Deadlock should have been reached in the year of grace 1942 after two centuries of your enlightened rule is more a commentary on your rule than on the political capacity of my countrymen: that the Deadlock should remain unsolved for days, weeks and months is a commentary on your Trusteeship, on the solvency of your statesmanship, more than on the myriad failings of your wards!

In one of his speeches noticed elsewhere Mr. Churchill declared that he had not become His Majesty's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the Empire. He did not realise how his words have operated to alienate feelings in this country. It is words like these that sink deep into the Indians' heart: they realise they can have no place in the British Commonwealth except as a dependency: such words do not alleviate the bitterness of feelings: when our people now think of Independence, they no longer think of it in terms of the variety enjoyed by the Dominions: whenever Independence comes to India, the Commonwealth will probably have ceased to have any attraction for her. What was possible yesterday, what is possible even today, may not, I fear, be so tomorrow. Mr. Churchill may live to rue the day he uttered the words which may prove to have lost to the Empire its brightest jewel. (a)

The generation to which I belong had been taught at school the 'benefits' of British rule which they were made to repeat by heart. This generation is fast dying out. When India will have achieved internal unity, it will be the young men and women of today with whom will rest the decision as to their future course—whether to continue within the Empire, or to strike out a course of their own. These young men and women have heard or seen little of the 'benefits' of British rule: their ears have been filled with the 'inequities' of British rule: their eyes have seen their leaders, men and women they revere, repeatedly suffer imprisonment for long terms for their patriotic struggle in the cause of their country's freedom. No doubt these patriots are, in your eyes and according to your laws, guilty of crimes against the State: in the eyes of their countrymen, they are patriots, not criminals: the phenomenon cannot be new to you: Anacreon Moore sang of it when Freedom was yet young in your own country. When, therefore, our young men and women of today will have achieved internal unity in God's good time, and when the occasion will arise for them to make their choice as to their future course, is it difficult for you to guess what their choice will be? The future choice will rest with our Youth: but the present rests with you: in

(a) Note—Since the above was written, Mr. Churchill in the course of a speech at the Lord Mayor's Banquet in London on 9th November 1943, observed, *inter alia*,

"Last year in 1942, I thought it right to say that I did not consider it any part of my duty to liquidate the British Empire. I do not conceal from you that I hold the same opinion today." (*The Daily Gazette, Karachi*, dated 10-11-1943).

It was no doubt intended to reassure his British and American hearers who were naturally ill at ease after the continued failure over another year to win India's heart: to most Indian ears it sounded an uncalled for irritant: to me it has served to reveal the speaker's mind behind his words. I have a feeling that even as he stood at the banquet board repeating the assertion, Britain's Prime Minister distinctly sensed the invisible, yet unmistakable, form of 'United India' looming up over the horizon of his Empire. The ways of Providence are inscrutable, and for all his assurance it may be that it has been ordained that it shall be no other than Mr. Winston Spencer Churchill who, at a date not beyond his powers of computation, will find himself proclaiming, on behalf of his great Country, their willing and cheerful acceptance of the Constitution of the 'Free United India' envisaged in 'THE INDIA CHARTER' of these pages.

shaping your present policy you will be moulding the future of your own country. Is the brightest jewel in the royal diadem to remain with the Empire, or is it to be lost to it?

People in this country have got into the habit of keeping old memories green—of remembering your past promises that have remained 'unfulfilled: of reminding you of them and blaming you for their non-fulfilment. Flöggng a dead horse! a meaningless, profitless, exertion: memories—unhappy memories—which had best be relegated to oblivion once and for all. If you, or your predecessors, in moments of weakness made promises which you do not feel to be in your interests to honour in the circumstances of today, I do not blame you. You have put forward the reasons therefor which represent your point of view, and which you deem have fully justified your action or inaction. I have no quarrel with you or your standpoint: even without the excuses that you have advanced, I would not hold you accountable for the non-achievement of Freedom by this country. One of your spokesmen once observed that Queen Victoria's Proclamation was not worth the paper on which it had been written because it was not a Parliamentary Statute. This country was shocked to hear this. I for one think the spokesman merely spoke the truth. Our people have been quoting against you the declarations of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and Lord Halifax: they have been quoting Mr. Churchill against himself: I think all this is futile: it simply does not help at all: as one of your great politicians once observed, "in politics, consistency is the virtue of fools, the hobgoblin of little minds: that there is no such thing as principle in politics: that it is circumstances which impart to every principle its distinguishing colour and its discriminating effect." In my view, what you said yesterday was dead and gone along with yesterday's sun: what you say and do today is alone what matters: and this, too, matters only so far as it will affect you and us *today*: with the setting of today's sun it will be as dead for our purposes as all its predecessors. As I have observed elsewhere, it is but human that one should want to hold on to one's possessions as long as possible. In asserting that he meant to hold the Empire together your Prime Minister but gave expression to this natural human feeling. If this country wants Freedom, it must gather the necessary strength behind its demand: that strength is absent today: that strength must come from within—the strength that can be generated only by internal unity: it cannot be imparted from without. We are not united yet: therefore we are weak: therefore we are not fit yet to receive and preserve Freedom: even if you were to grant us Freedom today, we would lose it tomorrow since we are not united, and for that reason lack the strength to face even the weakest opponent.

For this reason, I do not, today, ask you to confer Freedom on this country, as I once did.

Writing of Mr. Gladstone (a) Mr. Churchill has observed that 'he (Mr. Gladstone) knew that the heart of Britain is stirred by sentiment rather than by self-interest, by causes rather than by gains.' A critic might be tempted to remark that Britain's heart appeared to beat differently in different spheres: that if it was stirred by sentiment in other spheres, it did not appear to be so moved in the case of her Indian Empire: and that if sentiment had had a play in Britain's handling of the Indian problem, Dominion Status for India might conceivably have been an accomplished fact in 1935 if Mr. Macdonald had echoed Britain's sentiment when he expressed the hope that 'within a period of months rather than years there would be a new Dominion added to the Commonwealth of our Nations, a Dominion of another race, a Dominion which would find self-respect as an

(a) "GREAT CONTEMPORARIES" by Winston S. Churchill, 1941, Reprint, Page, 54.

equal within the Commonwealth I refer to India' (a). Our critic might comment that either Britain's heart has been changing from time to time, or the heart which Mr. Gladstone knew and of which Mr. Churchill wrote was but a reflex of their own conceits. It might be interesting, the critic might add, to ascertain whether what Mr. Churchill wrote of Britain's heart as it was known to Mr. Gladstone still held good, or whether it is today correctly reflected in Mr. Churchill's assertion as to holding the Empire together: also the relative influence of the 'causes' and the 'gains' in the case of India so far as India affects Britain's heart! Be it as it may: Britain's heart, as her conscience, is Britain's affair. With due deference to the views of Britain's Prime Ministers, past and present, the people of India may be excused if they prefer to be guided by their experience in entertaining the belief that in Britain's handling of Indian affairs sentiment finds no visible place whatever. Whatever view my countrymen may hold, I for one on the other hand feel that they can have no quarrel with Britain over it, for a great Empire cannot be governed or held by sentiment. Whatever policy Britain adopts, or does not adopt, in respect of this country hereafter, one may be sure it will not have been dictated by sentiment: and rightly so, in my view.

My appeal, therefore, is not to your sentiment, your traditions, your sense of justice and fairplay, your love of freedom, your desire to see the peoples of the world win their freedom. Some doubt your sincerity. I am prepared to believe you are sincere in your professions. But that is not the point. That is not what I am appealing to. I appeal to your instinct of self-interest. With half-headed, matter-of-fact, politicians and statesmen, as with hard-headed, matter-of-fact, businessmen, the only consideration that could or should count would be 'self-interest' and 'gains'—not 'sentiment.' With all the talk of Trusteeship, you gentlemen are not running the Empire with, or for, 'sentiment.' I would not do it, and I would not expect you to do it. It, however, seems to me that the time has come for you when it would be in your interests to take cognisance of the difference between what I may term your short-range and long-range 'interests'; your present and future 'gains'.

You came to this country to trade with it: you thrived: the Empire came in by the way: the Empire may remain, or may go: but you may still want to be able to trade with India. If you deal fairly with this country now, it may choose, when the time comes, to remain within the Empire: if you do not deal with it fairly now, if you impede its efforts to win its freedom, it may decide to break away from the Empire when the time comes to take a decision as sooner or later it inevitably must. If it then decides to break away, your trade will go with the Empire: you will be able to claim no preferential position for yourselves: you will find yourselves lumped in the common category of 'foreigners.' This country may not bar its gates against you, but then there may be no warm welcome to greet you—no singing of halle lujahs: you will be just 'foreigners'!

What will you choose? Present gains-accruing from the policy of allowing this country to remain divided as long as possible, thereby holding the Empire together according to your Prime Minister's conception as long as possible—with the prospect of losing those gains when this country gets united and chooses—not an unlikely event—to secede from the Empire? Or, present, and also future, gains—resulting from friendly relations that may come to be established and cemented by the adhesive bond of mutual goodwill born of genuine help you may give this country now in achieving internal unity?

(a) "RISE AND FULFILMENT OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA" by Thompson and Garratt, pages 632-33.

Of course, altruism can have no place in statecraft, and if you choose the latter course, it will just indicate that your sense of self-interest has asserted itself : if you choose the former, it will be just an act of short-sightedness on your part—by no means the first of its kind. In any case, it is for you to choose your course of action, and your well-wishers like me will fervently pray may He grant you His guidance. As far as this country is concerned, the immediate and only task before it is clear—it must continue to strive for internal unity—with your help, which would be gratefully welcomed—without your help, which would not be deplored.

CHAPTER II

TO OUR PRINCES

"And pray my Lord," says Signor Gaspar, "which do you esteem the happiest government, and the most likely to bring back again into the world, that Golden Age you just now mentioned, either the reign of such a good Prince, or the government of a Commonwealth?"

"I must always prefer the reign of a good Prince," answered Signor Octavian, "because such government is more agreeable to Nature; and if it be lawful to compare small matters with those that are infinite, more like the government of the Almighty, who being only one, governs the whole world. But not to dwell on this, you may observe, that in almost all the affairs of Life, as in war, navigation, architecture and the like, all is committed to the care, inspection, and government of one man only.

And if we come to our body, we see every member acts and does such offices as the heart commands. Besides, it seems reasonable that man should be governed by one, as well as other creatures, to whom Nature has taught such obedience, as is most for their interest and advantage. Observe the deer, cranes, and many other fowls when they travel, they always choose a Prince or Leader, which they follow and obey: And the bees, who with rational discourse (as it were) and so much reverence and respect observe the orders of their King, that few people in the world exceed them; which are strong arguments that the government of a Prince is more agreeable to Nature, than that of a Commonwealth."

Here Signor Bembo interrupting him said, "But, methinks, since God has given us liberty as the chief gift of Heaven, it is not reasonable it should be taken from us by any man whatsoever, nor that one man should partake of it more than another; which too often happens under the government of Princes, who keep their subjects in the strictest slavery; but in a well instituted Commonwealth, this liberty is ever entirely preserved. Besides, in judgment and deliberations the opinion of one man oftener happens to be false than that of a great many; because the mind of one man is sooner ruffled and discomposed by his passions, lust, anger, or hatred, than of a multitude, who like a vast quantity of water, are less liable to corruption than a small. And as to the example of the beasts, I think, with submission, it does by no means answer your end in making use of it, for both deer and cranes do not always follow and obey one and the same, but they change and vary their leaders, sometimes giving this precedence or government to one, sometimes to another; and in this respect it seems to me rather to resemble the form of a Commonwealth, than that of a kingdom, and therefore may be called a true and equal liberty, when they that sometimes command, obey again in their turns. Neither will the bees any wise help you out, for their king is not of the same species with them; for which reason to make it a parity, one should find out a creature to govern man of another species, and of a more excellent nature, if men must obey him in the same manner as brutes do their governors, who are not brutes themselves; as sheep do not obey one of their own kind, but a shepherd, which is a man, and of a more worthy species than their own. For which reasons, Sir, I humbly conceive a Commonwealth is much more desirable than a monarchy."

"Against what you have said, Sir," said Octavian, "I'll allege only one reason, that there are but only three forms of government; the first is Monarchy, a kingly government; the second Aristocracy, that is, when the government is vested in the nobility; and the third is Democracy, when the administration is in the people. Now the vices and corruptions to which all these three forms of government are subject are these: when Monarchy degenerates into Tyranny; Aristocracy into Oligarchy, that is, into the power of a few rich men; and Democracy into a certain confused and tumultuous administration of the whole people without any order at all.

Of all these corrupted governments it is most certain tyranny is by much the worst, as may be proved by an infinity of reasons; from whence it follows, that monarchy, or kingly government, is the best, because it is opposite to the worst; for you know very well that the effects of contrary causes must be always contrary to each other. Now as to what you say in relation to liberty I answer: that to live as a man will, is not true liberty; but to live according to good law, and to obey, is not less natural, useful, and necessary, than to command: And some things by nature are designed to command, as others again are to obey. It is true, there are two kinds of governing, one is imperious and violent, as is that of lords over their slaves, and the soul over the body; the other more mild and peaceful, as good Princes who govern their subjects by laws: And after this manner reason governs the appetite, and both of these are useful in their kinds; for the body seems to be formed by Nature to obey the soul, as the appetite reason. Besides there are a great many men whose actions only relate to, and concern the body, and these differ from studious persons, as much as the body from the soul; and though they only participate of so much reason, as just to know it, yet neither possess or enjoy it. These are naturally slaves, and it is much better for such to obey than bear rule."

"After what manner then," said Signor Gaspar, "are those to be governed who are not naturally slaves, but are born with a free genius, and virtuously disposed"? "With that mild, civil, royal government I have been talking of" says Signor Octavian; "and such a Prince would do well to commit to them the administration of such offices as they are capable of, that they may know how to rule and govern others of less capacity than themselves; provided still the supreme government be entirely vested in the Prince.

And because you have been pleased to say, that it is an easier matter to corrupt the mind of one than of a great many, I must tell you, it is yet much easier to find one wise and good than a great many. . . ." (a)

Your Highnesses,

As I read the speeches on Dominion Status delivered at the sessions of the Chamber of Princes on the 12th March, 1940, reproduced elsewhere in this work, the thought that first crossed my mind was that they constituted a command performance, that they expressed the views formed for Your Highnesses by the British Government who, inducing you to declare a preference for Dominion Status to be achieved by British India not otherwise than in Your Highnesses' exalted company, probably expected the declaration to operate as an effective fifteenth wheel in Jagannathjee's Rath (b) that has been bringing out, all these years, from the

(a) Extract from 'IL CORTEGIANO' by Baldassare Castiglione, 1478-1529, (Translation by Robert Sambel, 1723). GREAT ESSAYS OF ALL NATIONS, by F. H. Ritchard, pages 459-61.

(b) The Car of JUGGERNAUT of our English writers. Of the cars of the Trio, Balbhadra, Jagannath and Subhadra, that of Balbhadra has sixteen wheels, while those of the other two have fourteen each. An interesting account of the Rath Jatra including the car procession will be found in Beveridge's History of India, Vol. II, pages 51 et seq.

Mother of Parliaments, Dominion Status for India which Mr. Ramsay Macdonald of blessed memory had in the year of grace 1935 led this Country to expect to reach its frontiers within the space of a few months (a), but which is not known to have been sighted yet at any point of the Indian compass: and we seem to have been hearing the Rathvec murmuring to himself at every turn of the year,

ہنوز دہلی دُور است! —DELHI IS YET A—FAR OFF!

My next thought, however, was that the speeches were genuine stuff and had been prompted probably by an apprehension on Your Highnesses' part that if British India secured Dominion Status for itself, by itself, the States would be left out in the cold with their treaties with the Paramount Power—a prospect which, it is understood, Your Highnesses do not contemplate with enthusiasm, though on an earlier occasion His Highness the Maharaja of Patiala had declared “....while we are willing to enter the Federation, we are equally prepared to stand out of the Federal Scheme if British India is not anxious to have us.” (b): and that the speeches expressed a genuine desire on the part of Your Highnesses to sink or swim with your countrymen in British India. Although the speeches appeared to contain marked evidence of common draftsmanship lending support to the first view, I felt I would be doing Your Highnesses less than justice if I allowed myself to entertain, even if passing, a suspicion that Your Highnesses could be capable of taking dictation from any source. I, therefore, readily adopted the other view, and I am happy to be able to record that it gave me unbounded satisfaction to feel that Your Highnesses had not ceased to regard yourselves as Indians, that in the view of His Highness the Chancellor of your Exalted Order, India continued to remain the common Motherland of the Princes and the Peoples of the States and of the Peoples of British India: and I felt that the day was not distant when the people of British India would proudly reckon Your Highnesses among the foremost of their natural Leaders in the United India of their dreams.

From the resolution adopted at the sessions of the Chamber of Princes held at New Delhi on the 12th March, 1940 and the speeches made thereon, it appears that the constitutional advance contemplated by Your Highnesses was the attainment of Dominion Status within the British Commonwealth, and that ‘Independence,’ connoting immediate severance from the Empire, did not enter your deliberations. Whether the latter contingency has been considered by Your Highnesses, and, if so, what views have been formulated thereon by your Chamber, also whether Your Highnesses have formulated any views on the question of Pakistan, I do not know. For the purposes of this work, in the absence of any indication to the contrary, I shall assume that the reply to the above query is in the negative.

The position of the States vis-a-vis the general question of the “Political Problem of India,” or, more precisely, so far as the States are concerned, the

- (a) “I hope that within a period of months rather than years there will be a new Dominion added to the Commonwealth of our Nations, a Dominion of another race, a Dominion which will find self-respect as an equal within the Commonwealth. I refer to India.” (“RISE AND FULFILMENT OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA,” by Thompson and Garratt, pages 632-33).
- (b) Extract from His Highness's speech at the sessions of the Chamber of Princes, held on the 22nd January, 1935—Vide INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1935, Vol. I, page 432.

question of 'Constitutional Advance of the States' in relation to the Crown on the one hand, and British India on the other, would appear to be somewhat as stated below:

I—THE PRINCES' VIEWPOINT.

It appears from the above Resolution and Speeches that Your Highnesses are prepared to come under a Dominion Constitution along with British India, subject to the following provisions, namely:—

- (i) that the future constitution guarantees the sovereignty and autonomy of the States:
- (ii) that your treaty rights are protected:
- (iii) that no unit is placed in a position to dominate the others or to interfere with their rights and safeguards:
- (iv) that all units are ensured due share and fairplay:
- (v) that in the negotiations for formulating the Dominion Constitution the States and the Chamber of Princes should have a voice proportionate to their importance and historical position.

According to the statement (a) issued by His Highness the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir on the eve of the publication of the Cripps Scheme, Your Highnesses assume

- (vi) 'that in a self-governing India, every autonomous unit will share equally the fiscal and financial advantages accruing in such an India as well as the responsibilities and burdens entailed by the maintenance of peace and order and the provision of beneficial services and public utilities in the territories administered':

Your Highnesses hold the view

- (vii) 'that such of the Princes' prerogatives as enable them to afford a better life to their subjects and to ameliorate their lot must remain: while other privileges, which may be merely matters of honour and glory shedding effulgence on their personalities are of comparatively small account when set beside other considerations, such as the safeguarding of resources necessary for an up-to-date government and the relief of burdens borne by the States alone':

And, in promising support to the Cripps Scheme, the Chamber of Princes added the proviso

- (viii) that their support would be without prejudice to the 'inherent rights of the States'. (b)

II—THE VIEWPOINT OF THE STATES SUBJECTS

As every one knows, the States Peoples are, politically, yet in their infancy: they have become articulate but yesterday: they draw their inspiration almost entirely from the Indian National Congress. The following appears to be the goal set for the States Peoples:—

- (a) By the Congress.

(a) *Vide* page 44 ante.

(b) I have since seen the following in Mr. H. N. Brailsford's "SUBJECT INDIA", pp. 56-57.

"The Princes accepted as they had originally done in the case of the 1935 constitution, but this meant little or nothing, since they stressed the inviolability of their sovereign rights. The working of their minds was revealed in the somewhat farcical suggestion that a third separate federation might be created, consisting of some of the Princes' States under the name of Rajistan."

“That the Indian States participating in a future Federation should approximate to the Provinces of British India in

the establishment of representative institutions,
responsible government,
civil liberties, and
method of election to the Federal House.

The Congress stands for political, social and economic freedom in the States as in the rest of India.” (a)

(b) By the Rt. Hon'ble Mr. V. S. Sastri.

Mr. Sastri called upon the Princes to make the following three declarations:—

- (i) that Dominion Status is the central goal of Indian political evolution:
- (ii) that the Army should be completely Indianised:
- (iii) that the Princes would liberalise their administration, set up representative institutions, accept the principle of a privy purse, and in other words make their subjects politically efficient. (b)

(c) By the All-India States Peoples Conference.

The following resolution calling on the Rulers of the various Indian States to confer complete responsible government on their subjects was adopted by the Standing Committee of the All-India States Peoples' Conference at Bombay on 1st July, 1940 under the presidency of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru:—

“The Standing Committee desires to draw the attention of the people and the Rulers of the States to the fast and revolutionary developments that are taking place in the world, which must inevitably lead to fundamental changes in the political and economic order. The old order is rapidly passing and empires are fading away giving place to changed conditions. In the new order that will emerge out of the bloodshed and horror of war, it is inconceivable that out-of-date feudal, political and economic conditions can continue in India or elsewhere. The time for petty changes and slow reforms in the States has passed and attempts to check the inevitable and far-reaching changes that are long overdue must lead to disaster.

The present policy being pursued in most of the States is one of repression increasing in intensity under the pretext of war conditions and the Defence of India Act. Such policy displays a complete ignorance of the significant happenings in India and the world and must hasten this disaster. It (the Committee,) therefore, advises the Rulers to accept without reservation the modern form of State, that is, a State, which is conducted by popular and responsible representatives giving effect to the popular will. Even the ideal of responsible government in the States may soon fall short of the goal in the ever-developing world situation.

(a) *Vide* page 37 ante.

(b) *Vide* page 38 ante.

So far as the people of the States are concerned, they must hold fast to full freedom and complete responsible government and not accept 'anything less than this. During these critical times the States peoples must strengthen and organise themselves to face all the trials they may have to endure before they reach their cherished goal, freedom within the larger freedom of an independent India.' (a)

(d) By The All-India States Workers Convention.

(Poona, 30th July 1940. Pandit Nehru presiding).

Democratisation of States :—

Mr. Kashinath Vaidya of Hyderabad moved a resolution suggesting that peace and stability could only be established, when all nations were free and co-operated together in creating a world order, and that even in the immediate future Indian freedom could only be maintained on the basis of Indian unity and close co-operation of free democratic units in this national freedom. There could be no such co-operation between democratic and feudal units, which would inevitably come to conflict with each other. The same measure of democracy and freedom must thus prevail in all parts of India, whether Provinces or States, and each unit must join a free Indian Federation on equal terms. Any delay in the democratisation of the States was not only injurious to the people of the States, but also the freedom of India as a whole. The resolution hoped that the Rulers of States would declare their faith in Indian unity and freedom and would take steps to establish responsible government in their States and thus prepare and qualify them for taking part in a Constituent Assembly which would draw up free India's constitution. The resolution wanted to impress upon the States' people that real progress ultimately depended on their own organised strength and that they must prepare and organise themselves to share the burden and struggles during the days of trial through which India was passing. (b)

III—THE ATTITUDE OF HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT IN THE MATTER OF CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES IN THE STATES was indicated by His Excellency the Viceroy in his opening address to the Annual Session, of the Chamber of Princes held on the 13th and 14th March 1939, where he observed:—

"In the matter of constitutional changes or developments in the Indian States the attitude of His Majesty's Government is that the decision as to the constitution best suited to the needs of his people and his State rests with the Ruler himself to take, and that no pressure will be brought to bear on him in this respect by the Paramount Power. Nor will any obstruction be placed in his way by the Paramount Power, should he wish to give effect to constitutional advance consistent with his treaty obligations." (c)

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1940 Vol. II, page 352.

(b) " " " " " " " " 353.

(c) " " " " " " " " 1939 " I, " 423-424.

IV—His Highness the Maharaja of Nawanagar on "THE TRIPLE OBLIGATIONS OF THE PRINCES TO THE CROWN, THEIR STATES, AND TO INDIA"—

In his address at the sessions of the Chamber of Princes held at New Delhi on the 13/14th March 1939, His Highness observed as follows:—

"In the examination of this question at this last stage of negotiations, it is our duty, Your Excellency will doubtless appreciate, to apply ourselves dispassionately to the question as to how far, under the revised Draft of the Instrument of Accession and the Government of India Act of 1935 and any further amendments to that Act, with the effect in actual working, of the safeguards for the protection of the legitimate rights of the States embodied therein, it will be possible for us and our successors, in the fast changing circumstances of the country, effectively to discharge our triple obligation to the Crown, to our States, and to India.

Moreover, we have to examine carefully and to ensure that the power of the States to develop their natural resources remains unaffected, and that the financial implications of the scheme leave us sufficient margin to balance our budgets and to provide funds for the growing and legitimate need of improvements in, and raising the standard of, our administrations and in developing beneficent activities. Thereafter, we shall not hesitate to express freely and frankly what we may decide. Your Excellency has referred to the need of certain administrative Reforms in the States. We fully endorse the view that improvements in the administrations of States should emanate from the Rulers concerned wherever they may be needed. We recommend this course, not as a political expediency but as a sacred duty resting on us as Rulers. We have more than once given sympathetic consideration to the various aspects of this question and recognise that our greatest asset is the happiness and contentment of our peoples, and that no possible effort towards this end should be spared by us in ensuring the progress and prosperity of our loyal and devoted subjects. There is a clear distinction, however, between matters relating to improvement in administration and the question of Constitutional Reforms in the States. We claim that the decision with regard to the form and extent of Constitutional Reforms in the States must rest solely with the individual Rulers concerned.

The Indian Princes are not averse to progress in their States with due regard to local conditions and resources, and the record of development of the beneficent activities in their States is the best proof of their *bona fides*. We deny, however, the right of any party from outside to dictate to us or to coerce us in the matter of Constitutional Reforms within our States. Such short-sighted attempts cannot but retard the pace of evolution in the States, disturb the traditional good relations between the Rulers and their subjects and create an atmosphere of estrangement between the various regions of this country, which is fraught with serious consequences to all concerned. We have been reassured by the declarations recently made in Parliament on behalf of His Majesty's Government and repeated by Your Excellency, making it clear that 'the decision as to the Constitution best suited to the needs of his people and his State rests with the Ruler himself to take and that no pressure will be brought to bear on him in this respect by the Paramount Power.'

We are equally grateful for the assurance in Your Excellency's address which will be generally welcomed by the States, that 'the Paramount Power stands ready to support the Princes in the fulfilment of its treaty obligations.' We feel confident that no reasonable person or organisation which stands for the sanctity of pledges would expect of the Crown not to implement its pledges to the Princes both in letter and in spirit.

Your Excellency, we realise, second to none, the importance at the present juncture, of protecting the good name of the whole Princely Order. It is our aim to help to bring about a state of affairs in which criticism may find no justifiable ground for censure, for we realise that our usefulness to our subjects as well as to India and the Empire is directly dependent upon the ability of each and every State to discharge the responsibilities which rest upon it.

Your Excellency will, however, appreciate that there is no greater impediment to good government in a State than the weakening of its Ruler's authority. Yet such a weakening must inevitably result, if unjustified attacks are openly made against the established Governments of the States and even doubt is thrown upon the scope of the Ruler's sovereignty. We can assure Your Excellency that the various suggestions of administrative Reforms, where they are needed and to which you have referred in the course of your address, are very helpful and have been receiving the anxious consideration of the Governments of the States.

Moreover, while we do not object to fair and *bona fide* criticism, it is incontrovertible that in many cases, as Your Excellency has remarked in your address, we have been subjected to attacks which were entirely unjustified, attacks in which one has been unable to trace any scrupulous regard for strict accuracy, or any real desire to promote the welfare of the States or of its people! It is, therefore, not unnatural that the States should expect due protection against such attacks. In some of these attacks, it has been insinuated that the Princes are conspiring in a body with the Paramount Power to resort to a deliberate campaign of repression and reaction in the States. Your Excellency and Your Highnesses know that it is a baseless insinuation which we unequivocally repudiate. On the other hand, we can emphatically declare that God willing, the Indian Princes shall not be found wanting in any reasonable contribution which they may be called upon to make in the discharge of their obligations to the Crown and towards the ordered progress of their States and their motherland.

Your Excellency also referred in your address to the need for the smaller States, with limited resources, to co-operate and combine in matters of administration so far as it may be practicable. This question needs careful consideration from all the view-points involved, and relying on Your Excellency's knowledge and respect for the traditions of the Indian States, and for the pledges given to the States—big and small—in successive authoritative pronouncements, guaranteeing their internal autonomy and integrity, we take it as understood that Your Excellency's suggestion is intended to encourage co-operation, on a voluntary basis and to the extent that the States find it practicable, having due regard to local conditions, in certain services of administration, provided that the integrity and sovereignty

of the States concerned are not impaired. In order to encourage co-operative grouping on the aforesaid basis, it is essential that the combination should be entirely voluntary and not rigidly limited to the geographical boundaries of a group, so that it may inspire mutual confidence and trust which alone can ensure smooth working.

Your Excellency has also been pleased to emphasise the need for unity amongst our Order. We gratefully appreciate the sincerity of that advice and fully endorse it ourselves. In this connection, it is a matter of genuine gratification that generally the Princes of India—big and small—stand united today behind the reorganisation proposals which have been adopted by this Chamber and blessed by Your Excellency. We feel confident that this step will help us to stand united as a team in the discharge of our obligations to the Crown, to India and to the States.” (a)

V.—Mr. AMERY ON THE MEANING OF “INDIA FIRST” TO THE PRINCES.

“What again would be the meaning of “INDIA FIRST” to the Ruler of an Indian State? Would it not be something to this effect: ‘Much as I prize the privileged and secure position assured to me by my treaty with the Imperial Crown, sincerely as I believe that my long-established methods of government make for the welfare of my people, have I not a special obligation as a natural leader in India to make my contribution in Indian unity by the sacrifice of some of my sovereign powers and by such reforms in the internal constitution of my own State as will bring it more nearly in harmony with the political life of India as a whole?’

From every element in India the watchword “INDIA FIRST” demands comprehensive tolerance and compromise: acceptance of the real India as it exists today, not the uncompromising insistence upon the immediate and complete realisation of the theoretical India which any particular element or party has inscribed upon its banner.” (b)

VI.—“BASIC TESTS” adopted by the Princes for testing their administrations in relation to the question of REFORM within individual States.

“In this connection, though the question of reforms within individual States rests primarily with the Rulers and Governments of the States concerned, the Rulers in their meeting (at Bombay on the 9th June 1939) unanimously desired to recommend to the individual States the desirability of testing their administrations, where needed, with the following basic tests:—

(A) That special efforts should be made to have

- I—Clear and codified laws ensuring a reign of law for the States;
- II—judiciary properly manned by qualified law graduates or by persons with recognised judicial training and integrity;
- III—efficient and adequate police force supervised by competent officers with effective modern arms and equipment.

- (B) That, unless already done, there should be a clear demarcation between the personal expenditure of the Ruler and the State expenditure, and the former should be fixed on a reasonable basis as resolved by the Chamber of Princes.
- (C) That five or ten years programme on a clear cut plan should be prepared for the beneficent activities in the States, such as education, medical relief, agriculture, health, road development, etc.
- (D) That the States Governments should keep in close touch with the latest ameliorative legislation in British India and the Indian States, which may be suitable to their local conditions, such as indebtedness relief, and give it prompt consideration.
- (E) That the advisability may be considered of issuing a standing order within our States to the effect that any *bona fide* complaint supported on personal knowledge by certain prescribed number of disinterested local State subjects of good repute resident in the area concerned alleging corruption or undue harassment against any State official, shall be duly inquired into." (a)

VII—FUTURE POLICY OF THE STATES.

The importance of joint action on the part of the Princely Order both in regard to Federation and constitutional and other reforms in the States was stressed by His Highness the Jam Sahab of Nawanganar, Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, presiding at a joint conference of Indian Princes, representatives of certain Rulers, and States Ministers at Bombay on the 10th June 1939, when he observed, *inter alia*,:—

"It should be the endeavour of this Conference to bring the States to a common formula with regard to their line of reply, so that the future policy assures the integrity of units, the unity of India and the ordered progress of the country as a self-governing and autonomous Dominion of the British Commonwealth." (b)

VIII—"FREEDOM" as envisaged by His Highness the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir in a statement issued on the eve of the Cripps Mission:—

"Unless, therefore, the proposals entrusted to Sir Stafford Cripps are fundamentally adverse to the interests of the Indian States—and this is unthinkable—there is no reason why there should not be ample common ground between the States and the rest of India. FREEDOM must be our watchword—freedom from crippling restrictions and strangling control, freedom from the subordination of India's interests to the interests of other parts of the Commonwealth." (c)

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1939, Vol. I, page 431.

(b) " " " " " " " " " " " "

(c) *Vide* page 44 ante.

IX—MAHATMA GANDHI IN 1941.

"I am convinced that in the new world order which is bound to follow the insensate butchery, dignified by the name of war, the Princes will have place only if they become true servants of the people, deriving their power not from the sword, but from the love and consent of the people." (a)

X—OUR GREATEST ASSET—THE CHANCELLOR OF THE CHAMBER OF PRINCES, 1939.

"We....recognise that our greatest asset is the happiness and contentment of our peoples, and that no possible effort towards this end should be spared by us in ensuring the progress and prosperity of our loyal and devoted subjects." (b)

XI—THE PACE.

"The pace of administrative and constitutional reform in the States has rapidly increased in the last few years owing to the introduction of provincial autonomy in British India, the approach of Federation, and pressure—some times direct—from the Indian National Congress.....Numerous States announced their Rulers' intention to liberalise their constitutional machinery and to improve their administration. Many actually introduced reforms. A few Rulers declared that responsible government was the goal of policy and took steps towards it. Many Rulers announced progressive schemes of administrative reform in their respective States." (c)

XII—THE PRINCES' OUTLOOK.

Speaking at a joint meeting of Indian Princes and States representatives in August 1941, the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, *inter alia*, welcomed, in particular the Secretary of State's assurance that an agreement between the major political parties of British India would not be enough for the settlement of the Indian problem, but that the main elements in India's national life included not only political organisations and great religious or cultural communities, but also geographical and administrative elements, the provinces of British India and Indian States. He added that there need be no slavish fetish for imitating the British system of party parliamentary government as the only method suited to India. The American and other systems of government, suited to the needs of the countries concerned, had proved equally effective and progressive.

The desirability of finding an enduring and honourable basis for the future constitution of India, be it federal or confederal, be it a United Dominion or the United Dominions of India or anything else, transcended any stubborn adherence to accepted formulae for the mere sake of constitutional purism; and he for one would welcome and advocate a fair and dispassionate examination of all '*bona fide*' suggestions which might promise a solution of their problems, with due and effective protection of the legitimate rights of the various elements in the national life of India and upkeep of treaties and pledges.

(a) THE INDIAN YEAR BOOK, *The Times of India Press*, 1942-43, page 220.

(b) *Vide* page 323 ante.

(c) THE INDIAN YEAR BOOK, *The Times of India Press*, 1942-43, page 220.

they ought to know their own business. Besides they stuck to us in the hour of danger. So we must leave it at that.'

At the risk of offending the reader grossly, I will state my conclusion bluntly. As yet we have made no offer of eventual independence to India. The Cripps mission carried no such offer. So long as we stand behind the princes, protecting autocratic rights which depend on our armed power, India's independence is a meaningless word. It is to be presumed that the shrewder men in Delhi and Whitehall understand and understood this all the time. This may be imperial statecraft, but is it honesty? I believe that independence is what Indians want and mean to get. Dominion status is not what they desire. But so much is certain: we cannot keep them contented with this less attractive condition by manipulating the princes against them. We shall deserve both their anger and their contempt if we try." (a)

Can the Princes fit into an Indian Federation?

(The following extract is taken from Mr. H. N. Brailsford's "SUBJECT INDIA", pages 106-109).

"We have still to face the gravest of the difficulties that confront Federation. Hitherto we have dealt only with the provinces under direct British rule and ignored the Princes' States, which cover a third of the area of the Peninsula and include a quarter of its population. Federation might, indeed, begin with the provinces, leaving the States as they are, under the suzerainty of the Crown. This dualism can only be provisional. In a very short time it would become intolerable. The territories of the States are scattered in a baffling patchwork in and around the provinces. Questions of defence, customs and communications are common to both. In race, language and religion the States repeat the pattern of British India. But the difficulties in the way of union are formidable in spite of this identical heritage from history. To begin with, the States number no less than 562 units, which range in area from the acreage of Hyde Park to that of the kingdom of Italy. Most of them are so small and so poor, that even if they were well-governed, they could not support the cost of a civilised administration. A group of these dwarf States might be able to finance the hospitals and higher schools their peoples need, but not one alone. Congress has proposed to group them in units with a minimum population of two million inhabitants. In other cases the territories of a prince are widely scattered, or else they cut across linguistic boundaries, as those of some Provinces also do—a defect which makes needless difficulties for the administration and especially for the schools. A dictator with a good map in front of him and the statistics of the latest census would make short work of this confusion. But the least of these petty rulers can claim his rights as a sovereign, secured to him and his heirs for ever, through grant or treaty by the King Emperor.

The next difficulty is that these States show an equal diversity in the level of their civilisation and the quality of their administration. Some of them, especially Mysore, Travancore and Baroda, are progressive, well-governed, and in some important matters ahead of British India. Like other travellers before me, I felt in Baroda an atmosphere of contentment and happiness which I encountered nowhere under British rule. There are other States in this fortunate class, but they are the exceptions. In general the States are backward and reactionary. Some of them retain a feudal system:

reminiscent of medieval Europe, under which their subjects are bound to perform the most onerous servitudes to the prince, to supply him on demand with food and contributions for feasts and other solemn occasions, and even to perform forced *corvée* labour for his benefit. In few of them are the civil rights of citizens respected, and there is rarely any liberty of the press or of association. Until lately there was hardly even a pretence of distinguishing between the State budget and the prince's private purse: he taxed as he pleased and took what he pleased: even now such improvement as there is is largely nominal. The prince fairly often appropriates a third or a fifth of the total revenue of his State. In 1926 the Raja of Jamnagar took £ 700,000 out of £1,000,000. Custom expects only a lax standard of personal conduct from the prince or his favourites. In short, most of these princes are autocrats and few of them are remarkable for their benevolence. Indians, it may be, are less impatient of personal rule than Europeans, and are said to prefer it, if it reaches an average level of decency, to the cold efficiency of our bureaucracy. In only twenty-three of the 562 States is there a consultative council of sorts: in the best of them it is elected at least in part and exerts some influence: in only one enlightened little State, Aundh, is there responsible self-government. Some check upon oppression is exercised by the British Residents and Political Agents, but it must be gross and notorious before they intervene: when they do so, the prince may be exiled or even deposed. But the prevalent belief in India is that Residents are usually more exacting in requiring a loyal and submissive attitude towards the Paramount Power than in imposing even a moderate standard of good government. The princes are tenants at will and most of them are aware of blots on their record to which the Resident could point, if they should incur his displeasure. Some of them, moreover, are so unpopular with their subjects that they could not maintain themselves were it not that British troops are available to restore what is misnamed 'order'. On occasions they have in fact been used for this purpose. There is no pretence of equality in this feudal relationship. As Lord Reading wrote in 1926 to the Nizam of Hyderabad, the greatest of the princes, in rejecting a claim of his which was at least arguable:

'The Sovereignty of the British Crown is supreme in India, and therefore no Ruler of an Indian State can justifiably claim to negotiate with the British Crown on an equal footing!'

It is their perception of this relationship of dependence which dominates the attitude of Indian Nationalists towards the princes as a body. They look like Indians, but are in fact the bodyguard of the British Viceroy. Any proposal to bring them into Indian politics is inevitably viewed with suspicion. They would be, in any Federal Assembly, what, 'the King's men' were in the House of Commons of the eighteenth century, a disciplined faction which in crucial divisions would vote under the eyes, if not under the direction, of the Imperial Power. To dream of independence, or even of self-government if the Indian Union started with this handicap, would be to cherish a very silly illusion. Even if this fear could be dismissed as excessive, the fact remains that the princes would form a nearly solid conservative and even reactionary block. Their interests and outlook are those of great land-owners, like the rest of their class in India, passive receivers of tribute, who perform no useful social or economic function. If they wielded, as was proposed in the Act of 1935, a third or more of the votes in the federal Legislature, the chance that a progressive government would ever hold office would be negligible. This reasoning assumes that the

princes would nominate the delegations from their States and expect them to vote as required. The word used in the Draft Declaration which was the brief of the Cripps Mission was 'appoint'. With very few, if any, exceptions, as things stand today, that is a reasonable reckoning. British Conservatives are usually frank in their utterances on this subject. They would call in the Old World to redress the Balance of the New. Medieval India is to act as a barrier against Hindu radicalism and the spectre of social revolution. These are reckless and provocative tactics. If anything in our staid island could arouse a revolutionary temper, it would be rash use of the Lords' veto. The habitual use of the princes' votes to serve the interests of property would have in the hotter climate of India an even more explosive effect.

On this question, the attitude of Congress and other Indian progressives is what any democrat would expect of them. They aspire to a union of all India, and realise that without the Princes' States it would be not merely incomplete but in the long run unworkable. But they insist that any State which enters the Federation must be represented by a delegation freely elected by its people. This condition, as Congress made clear in its comments on the Cripps offer, must apply to the Constituent Assembly which draws up the constitution of the Federation. This should not surprise us. Legal experts were mobilised, when the Act of 1935 was drafted, to study every model and precedent for federation. In no recorded instance have autocratic States federated with democratic States. It may be said that in the fulness of time, under the pressure of Indian public opinion, the princes would, one by one, give way, if they were within the Federation, and would emancipate their subjects. That may be a correct forecast. But it would be a slow, anxious and turbulent process, which would put the statesmanship of the young commonwealth to an excessively severe test, for it might be complicated by issues both of class and religion. In the two biggest States, Hyderabad and Kashmir, the princes and the majority of their subjects are not of the same faith. The Federation might have to send its troops to support an obstinate autocrat-an odious duty which might break it. But the chief objection to the easy-going solution of leaving this matter for time to settle is that the vote of the princes would at the Constituent Assembly and during the early formative years give to the Federation an ultra-conservative structure, which might in after years prove difficult to amend. The princes, who cling to all the rights and trappings of sovereignty, would combine with the more conservative Muslims to reduce the powers and functions of the Federation to the barest rudiments. This the Muslims, with scores of millions behind them, have every right to do, if they choose, but five hundred titled landlords ought not to weight the scales.

The straightforward way out of this tangle is that the Provisional Government of British India, when it invites the States to send their representatives to the Constituent Assembly, should stipulate that they shall be elected under conditions and by a franchise not less liberal than those which obtain in the provinces of British India. It is probable that in the atmosphere of hope and exultation which should prevail at this proud moment in Indian history, few of the princes would dare to refuse. If they did, the struggle between them and their subjects would be sharp but short-on one condition. It is that the Paramount Power should refrain from supporting the more reactionary princes. The proper course would be that the Viceroy should at the earliest possible moment issue a statement to the effect that the States must, like the rest of us, respect the ideals for which the United Nations

fought, and that if they oppose the reasonable claims of their peoples, they can expect no support from the Paramount Power. That in nine cases out of ten would ensure a peaceful transformation. If in the tenth case it should be necessary to send troops, the prince should pay the suitable penalty for misgovernment-deposition. In our Indian record nothing has become us so ill as our maintenance of the gaudy and barbarous anachronism most of these States still are. In return for their submission, we have tolerated conditions that have kept scores of millions in a stagnant backwater, as unwholesome as it was outmoded. The relatively happy conditions of Mysore, Travancore, Baroda and two or three more of these States serves only to throw into relief the neglect and exploitation that prevail elsewhere. Into the legal intricacies of this question I have not thought it necessary to enter. Whatever be our obligations to these princes, we have always exacted some minimum standard of good government. Can we in the twentieth century reckon autocracy under that head ?”

Our Analysis of the Problem—

The above brief summary shows the position of the States vis-a-vis the questions of administrative reforms and constitutional changes. It shows the aspirations of the States subjects, the expectations of your countrymen across your borders, and the extent to which Your Highnesses appear to be prepared to advance: there is also the advice tendered to Your Highnesses by the Secretary of State for India on the larger issue of ‘India First’ in the India of Tomorrow and Your Highnesses’ part therein. This has been the position as it has stood upto yesterday.

There has been a change in it overnight. Upto yesterday, the people of British India, both Muslims and Hindus, had visualised Dominion Status as the goal of a United India: so had it also been the goal Your Highnesses had contemplated. Today, the Muslims of British India have adopted another goal—Pakistan. If they succeed in reaching it, there will be a Pakistan and a Hindusthan in this sub-continent. Whether each will have Dominion Status and will constitute a separate Dominion is not known. Neither is it known what the position of the States will be vis-a-vis Pakistan and Hindusthan. The protagonists of Pakistan do not appear to have visualised the States in their vision of Pakistan. In his address to the All-India Muslim League in April last, Mr. Jinnah referred to the States as ‘the biggest hurdle’ in the path of Pakistan, but offered no indication as to how it was to be negotiated. In any case, if Pakistan were to materialise, there would probably be two courses open to the States:—

- (a) to attach themselves to Pakistan or Hindusthan: or,
- (b) to maintain for themselves the present *status quo* and continue their relations with the Crown under their existing treaties.

It does not appear whether Your Highnesses have contemplated the future of the States with Pakistan functioning.

Your Highnesses will have observed that this Volume has discussed the question of Pakistan fairly fully. It has not, however, discussed it in relation to the States. I have stopped short of that as I have felt with Mr. Jinnah that it constitutes ‘the biggest hurdle’ which, in my judgment, it would be wisest to leave to Mr. Jinnah to negotiate. I have, on the other hand, suggested an arrangement which, if adopted, would, in effect, leave the ‘hurdle’ and its

negotiation on the remote academic plane which, in Mr. Churchill's inimitable language, might not demand consideration in any period which human beings need take account of!

What is that arrangement, and what is the Princes' part in it?

Your Highnesses will have observed that the States subjects have set for themselves, as their goal, the democratic ideal of responsible government through representative institutions. The ideal has caught their imagination as it has in the case of their brethren in British India; and, as observed in the summary, some members of your Order have already 'declared responsible government as the goal of their policy, and taken steps towards it'. How far these steps would prove successful would depend upon the circumstances of each individual State. If the population were homogeneous, they might succeed. If, however, it were heterogeneous, in course of time there would arise the questions of minorities developing into problems: the history of British India would repeat itself in the States, and the Problem that is now restricted to British India would spread over the States!

In the case of British India, the march of events has shown that the unmixed application of Western ideas of Democracy to the conditions obtaining in this Country has not proved an unmixed success. It has created the Hindu-Muslim Problem which has not been solved yet. In most of the States, the conditions are not different: and if unmixed Democracy were attempted there, the results would not be different.

Our analysis of the Problem in the case of British India has revealed that the social and economic differences and inequalities between the Hindu majority and the Muslim minority has created a state of intense distrust between the communities which has spread to the political sphere with the result that it has now reached the stage where the Muslims have expressed their determination to oppose the transfer of power to the people on the democratic basis which would result in the passing of power into the hands of the Hindu majority: yesterday, the Muslims claimed equality with the Hindus: today, they claim separation—a separate State for themselves. We have seen that the minority feared perpetual rule by the majority with no prospect of power passing to the former at any time under any conditions that could be envisaged. This would also be the position in the States, unless there were absolute homogeneity of population in a State, being either 100 per cent Muslims, or 100 per cent Hindus, or both in the proportion of 50 : 50.

Whether there are many or any States where these ideal conditions prevail I have not investigated. In most of the provinces in British India they do not. Is there a way, then, of producing a state of equality in the political field in the areas where the communities happen to be unequally distributed? The Political Formula proposed in this work is an attempt in this direction.

Our Formula Safeguards the Princes' Interests.

On an examination of this Formula Your Highnesses will have observed the following features:

(a) *that it safeguards the interests of the Rulers inasmuch as*

(i) They would remain Rulers in their States 'freed from crippling restrictions and strangling control' as envisaged by His Highness the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir:

(ii) the State-Units would attain the powers and the status of autonomous units of the Federation, at the same time retaining their internal autonomy and integrity unimpaired:

- (iii) the Rulers would have a direct personal voice and hand in the administration of the Federal Government of All-India, thereby attaining their rightful position as the natural leaders of the Indian People, securing added power, status and prestige for the Princely Order in the national and international spheres:
- (iv) the treaty rights of the States would remain intact while remaining in abeyance during the life of the Federation:
- (v) through the adoption of the principle of the Privy Purse, it would become possible to stabilise the financial position of the States on sound foundations:
- (vi) through codification of laws, maintaining a high standard in the services, with adequate provision for internal security, the States would become modernised and administratively be on equal footing with the most advanced provinces of British India, bringing contentment, peace and prosperity to the Rulers and the Subjects alike:
- (vii) through the contentment, prosperity and happiness of their subjects, resulting from the administrative reforms and constitutional advance to be brought about under my Political Formula, the Rulers would gain for themselves a warm corner in the hearts of their grateful subjects, prove to be their BAPU in real fact, not in mere name, and create a miniature RAM RAJ in their States with the Rulers as the fountainhead from which all happiness, peace and plenty would flow all around to all the nooks and corners of their States.

Also of Their Subjects

- (b) *that it advances the interests of the States Peoples inasmuch as*
 - (i) it would secure for them local self-government through the establishment of municipal bodies to be elected and administered by the people:
 - (ii) the financial stability following from the adoption of the principle of the Privy Purse would enable the adoption of beneficent measures calculated to secure the advancement of the States through development of their natural resources, their trade, commerce and industry:
 - (iii) it would secure for them responsible government through representative institutions, e. g., legislative councils elected by the people, on suitable franchise, with the Rulers assisted by Councils of Ministers on the lines prevailing in the British Indian provinces :
 - (iv) it would secure an equal voice in the administration of the States to all sections of the people on the basis of equality, with no section placed in a position to dominate the others.

- (c) *that it safeguards the interests of the States vis-a-vis the other units of the Federation, inasmuch as*
- (i) all the units having equal voice in all matters, no unit would be placed in a position to dominate the others:
 - (ii) since the financial liabilities of the Federation would be equally borne by the British Indian units with the Indian States, the latter would be assured that no undue burden was placed upon them to their disadvantage vis-a-vis the other units of the Federation:
 - (iii) it provides for the States having an equal voice in the body that may come to be set up to involve the Constitution of the India tomorrow.
- (d) *that it safeguards the interests of the States in relation to the Crown, inasmuch as*
- (i) it provides that in the event of the Federation failing to function for any reason, the powers of the Princes which had been transferred to the Federation would revert to the Princes:
 - (ii) it provides that during the period the States participated in the Federation, their respective treaties with the Crown would stand suspended in so far as they would be affected by the powers transferred to the Federation. In a contingency such as that mentioned in (i) above, involving the reversion of such powers to the States, the treaties would simultaneously stand revived and become fully operative as they were before the States joined the Federation:
 - (iii) the States' joining the Federation under the Formula would involve no abrogation, or abatement, or contraction of their inherent sovereignty which would remain entirely intact and sacrosanct.
- (e) *that in enabling the creation of a strong UNITED INDIA, it will secure for the Country "freedom from the subordination of her interests to those of other parts of the Commonwealth", as envisaged in the 'FREEDOM' of the India of Tomorrow, by His Highness the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir.*

The Bapoo and his Children

I hold in high admiration the Princely Order of this ancient land, an Order whose illustrious members of both the sexes have filled with lustre many a page of its long history: and I have no hesitation in confessing to a decided partiality for your Exalted Order adorned as it is by the scions of great Houses that have brought to this Country undying fame and renown in the various spheres of life, not the least being your martial traditions handed from father to son down countless generations each adding fresh lustre of honour to the sword of his fathers. I have, similarly, a warm corner in my heart for the State Subject, be he the town-dweller or the peasant on his tiny farm. Every time I have held converse with one, I have felt myself transported to the dim distant past, when his forefathers followed the same occupation in the town life of their day, or tilled the same acre of land, wore the same simple clothing, ate the same simple food, lived the same simple life—a hard life ever, yet a life of honest simplicity.

and contentment. In conversing with the simple peasant before me as he leaned against his plough, it has done my heart good to hear him relate his simple lot with a smile of contentment or an anxious look turned skywards if Indra happened to have been halting with his life-giving showers, invoking blessings on his 'BAPOO': and everytime an Amen slipped past my lips as I realised the wisdom of a Divine Dispensation that had provided a 'BAPOO' for this simple child of Nature: I realised that just as this peasant had his place in the life and economy of this ancient land, so had the 'BAPOO' his: I realised that to disturb this age-old arrangement, founded on simple human relationship—the relationship of a 'BAPOO' with his children—to disturb such relationship with new-fangled ideas of relationship native of other climes but foreign to the genius of our people—would be a crime—a crime not so much against the 'BAPOO' as against his children, the very persons for whose benefit such new-fangled ideas are sought to be imposed upon this country's simple life. I am conscious of the fact that there are 'Bapoos' and 'Bapoos': that while there are 'Bapoos' who are an ornament to their class, there are others who are not. Yet, it can safely be asserted that the proportion of the latter is but microscopic, and that in the case of the great majority of the Order, their concern for the advancement, welfare and happiness of their subjects leaves no occasion for them to hanker after new-fangled notions equally foreign to their genius and their temperament.

The Princes' Part in United India.

To my mind the States are destined to play a large part in the India of Tomorrow—the United India of my Formula in which the States will be equal partners with British India. As I visualise the future polity of the United India of my Formula, the peoples of the States will be called upon to take an equal share in its administration along with their brethren of British India. It would, therefore, be desirable and advisable as also necessary that they should be provided an adequate grounding in the art of government-responsible self-government through representative institutions. As has been observed in the quotation from Castiglione given at the beginning of this Chapter,

“Such a Prince would do well to commit to them (his subjects) the administration of such offices as they are capable of, that they may know how to rule and govern others of less capacity than themselves.” (a)

According to the summary given above, some States have already taken steps in the direction of responsible government: what is required would be that the arrangement might be adopted more widely by the introduction of the principle of self-government in municipal bodies, the elective principle in legislative bodies, and government through a council of ministers on the lines obtaining in British India Provinces: so that having learnt how to govern themselves on enlightened principles, the States subjects may know how to do justice to their part when they are called upon to participate in the governance of the United India of Tomorrow.

In his address at the sessions of the Chamber of Princes on the 13/14 March 1939 on the “Triple Obligations of the Princes to the Crown, their States, and to India,” His Highness the Maharaja of Nawanagar made the following very cogent and meaningful observations:—

“We realise that our usefulness to our subjects as well as to India and the Empire is directly dependent upon the ability of each and every State to discharge the responsibilities which rest upon it.” (b)

(a) *Vide* page 318 ante.

(b) “ ” 324 “

"On the other hand we can emphatically declare that, God willing, the Indian Princes shall not be found wanting in any reasonable contribution which they may be called upon to make in the discharge of their obligations to the Crown and towards the ordered progress of their States and their motherland" (a)

which must convey a pointed and personal message to every individual member of the Princely Order when construed in the light of the 'GRAVE' note struck by His Excellency the Viceroy at the Annual Sessions of the Princes' Chamber held about the time of the arrival of Sir Stafford Cripps, when he pleaded earnestly with the Princes to adjust themselves to the rapidly changing currents

"to achieve not only their own healthy development, but also, if I may strike a graver note, their survival as valued and respected elements in the new Indian policy which was yet to be evolved." (b)

Fair and Dispassionate Examination—

While there are some responsible leaders in this Country who have been irresponsible enough to talk of the elimination of the Princely Order from the Scheme of Things in the India of the future, I am one of those who recognise the good your Order has done in the past and is doing in the present, and the much greater good it is capable of doing in the great days ahead. I am sure Your Highnesses are keenly alive to the daily changing situation in the world and in this Country which, in the nature of things, cannot leave the States unaffected. Speaking in August 1941, His Highness the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes observed that

"he for one would welcome and advocate a fair and dispassionate examination of all *bona fide* suggestions which might promise a solution of their problems, with due and effective protection of the legitimate rights of the various elements in the national life of India and upkeep of treaties and pledges." (c)

This attempt, His Highness stated, should not be shirked merely because it involved adoption of unorthodox basis which might be suited to the special needs of India (d). I invite Your Highnesses to subject the Formula I have suggested in this Volume to "a fair and dispassionate examination." It enunciates the principles of a constitution that would secure for the Country a government based on the solid and sure foundations of EQUALITY—Equality between Muslim and Hindu, High Caste and Low Caste, High Class and Low Class, Prince and Commoner—Equality that would be synonymous with FRATERNITY, with LIBERTY—the goal of INDIAN FREEDOM! Does the Scheme appeal to Your Highnesses as holding the promise of a solution of this Country's Problems?

The Choice

I believe there is enough enlightenment among your Exalted Order to enable Your Highnesses to realise that it would be in your interests to move with the times, hand in hand with your own Raiyats, and in step and in line with your brother Indians across your borders. I believe that the old-time spirit of paternalism, the MA-BAP spirit, is actively alive among Your Highnesses, and, in many cases, is effectively reflected in your administrations: that you do not

(a) *Vide* page 324 ante.

(b) " " 328 "

(c) " " 327 "

(d) " " 328 "

value any title or term of address more highly than the simple and affectionate 'BAPOO', the term used by the Raiyats in addressing their Rulers. I believe Your Highnesses are imbued with the spirit of 'oneness' with your own peoples and with the peoples of the adjoining territories of British India: that Your Highnesses realise that in the future world order it would be a sine-qua-non for the survival of your Order that in the life and governance of the United India of the future there should prevail the completest identity of interests between the Princes and their Peoples on the one hand, and between them both and the peoples of British India on the other hand.

As for the Peoples of the present British India, after over a century of contact with Democratic principles and institutions as interpreted and evolved by Britain, I feel that there is still ingrained in them a natural understanding and partiality for Autocracy which I for one believe is more suited to the genius of our Peoples both in British and in Indian India: and while they have been playing with Democracy as a child would be attracted to a new toy, they have always understood and appreciated Autocracy better than Rule based upon the counting of heads. To them, while Benevolent Autocracy would be the ideal form of rule best suited to their genius and which they have known down countless generations, rule by a body of persons that would include members of the Princely Order side by side with the pick from among themselves, would be a happy blend of the present with the past: and they would, I feel confident, whole-heartedly welcome a Free India Cabinet (as is proposed in my Political Formula) comprising members of the Princely Order and Representatives of the peoples of the States and of the Provinces, all on equal footing and in equal proportions, both our great communities being represented in the Cabinet on a footing of absolute equality. A Cabinet so composed, deriving its sanctions, its strength and its support, as also its inspiration, from a Parliament (composed as proposed in my Formula) equally representing all the interests in the Country, embodying the collective wisdom, talent and experience available in the Country, would constitute a form of governance which would be a happy combination of Democracy with Benevolent Autocracy, ensuring the highest good of all the Peoples of this great Country with the unfettered will of Free Peoples expressed through their freely chosen representatives.

What is to be Your Highnesses' verdict on my FORMULA?

A Great Responsibility

A great responsibility rests on Your Highnesses at this fateful hour—greater far, perhaps, than we all realise! To me it seems that the Fates have placed the Key to the Future in Your Highnesses' hands. It is for Your Highnesses to judge the situation for yourselves and then to announce your decision. If the decision happens to be in favour of the Formula of this Volume, I suggest that Your Highnesses announce it by a Declaration through the Chamber of Princes. I suggest a Declaration as it would clarify the situation in the Country and help the other interests to examine their own position in relation to your decision. The Declaration I suggest might be somewhat as follows:—

A Declaration

"Whereas we are satisfied that the principles proposed for a Federal Constitution for a United India as provided in the Political Formula embodied in the publication entitled "THE INDIA CHARTER," are calculated to evolve a Federal State based on the secure foundations of Justice and Equality among the federating units, and whereas we are further satisfied that the creation of such a Federal State based on such solid foundations would secure and serve best the larger interests of British India and the

Indian States, and whereas we are convinced that in the interests of contentment, peace and progress in this great sub-continent, it is the sacred duty of all Indians, whether in British India or in the States, to do everything possible to help bring such a Federal State into existence, and whereas we feel that the Indian Princes would be doing their part in securing the above end if they declared their faith in such a Federal State, and further declared their willingness and readiness promptly to join such a Federal State when it was constituted, and also declared their willingness and readiness to participate in the drafting of a Constitution for such a Federal State by joining the Constitution—Making Body as envisaged in the Political Formula embodied in “THE INDIA CHARTER,” we, the Princes of India, represented by the Chamber of Princes, after mature consideration and full deliberation, hereby declare

- (a) that we accept the PRINCIPLE of the POLITICAL FORMULA enunciated in “THE INDIA CHARTER:”
- (b) that we accept the said Formula as embodying the Basic Principles providing the foundations and groundwork of the Constitution for a Federal Government for India:
- (c) that having accepted the Principle of the Formula, we are agreeable and are prepared
 - (i) to take the necessary steps to introduce the internal reforms and constitutional changes within our States as outlined in the Formula:
 - (ii) to participate, and play our full part, in the setting up, and in the administration, of a Federal Government as envisaged in the Formula:

and we hereby appoint.to take all the necessary steps and to make all the necessary arrangements in this behalf along with the representatives of the States Peoples and of the concerned interests in British India.”

What the Motherland Expects of her Princely Sons

It is now for Your Highnesses to think for yourselves, to weigh the facts with cool judgment, and to take your decisions thereon. There is the DEAD-LOCK in the Country. Is it your finding that the Country has a call on the Princes to contribute their share towards the dissolution of the Deadlock? If so, these pages will be found to contain an indication of a practicable line of action for the Princes. The Princes are faced with a dual task-duty towards their subjects, and duty towards their Motherland: fortunately, these are not incompatible: Your Highnesses alone can decide for yourselves what exactly is to be your conception, of these duties, and how best you could perform them: and having taken your decisions, Your Highnesses must act—act vigorously—as all Leaders of Men should; and lead your countrymen to the Promised Land-FREEDOM. Our Motherland expects her Princely Sons to do their DUTY—fearlessly, generously! And may our Creator grant them the right guidance, the right judgment, and bless their efforts with success! Amen!

CHAPTER III

TO OUR PRINCES' SUBJECTS

"Of Democracy (a)—

Next then, I suppose, we must examine democracy and find out how it arises and what it is like, so that we may know what the democratic man is like and estimate his value.

That is the next step, I think.

Does not a city change from government by a small class to government by the people through uncontrolled pursuit of wealth as the ultimate object of life?

How?

I think that the governing class in such a city hold their position because of their wealth, and that therefore they will not pass laws to prevent the young men from living extravagantly and spending and wasting their goods; for they will want to increase their own wealth and importance by buying up what has to be sold and lending the young men money. They will.

Now, it is quite clear, is it not, that it is impossible at one and the same time to worship money and keep a high standard of honesty among the citizens; one or the other will have to go?

That is clear enough.

Sometimes the governing class in a city has so neglected discipline that men of remarkable ability have been forced into poverty.

That is quite true.

Such men settle in the city, armed and ready to sting, some in debt, some having lost their citizenship, some both, hating and plotting against the men who have acquired their wealth, entirely set on revolution. Yes.

But the money-makers fix their eyes on the ground and pretend not to see them; instead they go on poisoning with their wealth any of the other citizens who give up the struggle, and increase the number of drones and beggars in the city. While, as for themselves and their own sons, their young men are luxurious and useless both in mind and body, lazy and too soft to endure pain or resist pleasure.

Well?

When the ruling class and the ruled meet one another in the streets or at public meetings, at festivals or in the army, when they serve side by side either on board ship or in the ranks and see one another facing danger, the

(a) Extract from Plato's 'REPUBLIC' (translation by Jowett), as reproduced in 'GREAT ESSAYS OF ALL NATIONS' edited by F. H. Pritchard, pages 2-4.

poor will not be despised by the rich. On the contrary, often a poor man, strong and brown, stands in the ranks next to a rich man, who has lived an indoor life and is fat; and, seeing his shortness of breath and general discomfort, will surely think that such men as these are rich simply because the poorer classes are cowards. And whenever he meets his friends the word will get passed round, 'We can do what we like with these men; they are good for nothing.'

I am quite sure that they will.

Well then, I suppose, democracy comes into existence when the poor have conquered the rich, killing some, banishing others, and sharing citizenship and office with the rest; and generally in such a city the offices are distributed by lot.

That is how democracy is established, whether it be through armed force or whether the opposite side give in at once through fear.

Well now, how will they live and what kind of a government will theirs be? First, of course, they are free, and the city is full of freedom and free speech and every one may do whatever he wishes.

So they say.

And where every one may do as he wishes it is quite clear that each man will order his own life in the way that pleases him best.

Yes.

So, I imagine, under this government we shall find men of all sorts and kinds.

Certainly.

Then this is likely to be a very beautiful form of government. It will be like a rainbow-coloured cloak of many shades, for it will have every type of character and so will be very beautiful to look at. And perhaps, just as children and women like the look of bright colours, many people will think this kind of government the most beautiful. Indeed they will.

Then, my friend, it is a convenient city to look for a constitution in. Why?

Because it has all kinds of constitutions through every one being able to do what he likes. You can go to it as if it were a universal provider of constitutions, choose which you prefer, and found your city.

There will certainly be a good choice.

There is no need to hold office in this city, if you are not equal to it, nor to obey the government, if you do not want to, nor go to war because the city is at war, nor to keep the peace because the city is at peace, if you personally don't want peace. Is not this a gloriously pleasant kind of life for the moment?

Perhaps, for the moment.

And how considerate such a city is! No nonsense there about trifles! They think nothing there of all the things we mentioned with such pride when we were founding our city; we said then that no one could become a

good man if his childhood were not passed in beautiful surroundings and in the practice of beautiful deeds. This city sublimely tramples all this down and does not care from what sort of a life a man comes when he enters politics, but honours him if he only just says that he is friendly to the masses.

It is wonderful.

Then these and similar characteristics would be the features of a democracy; it seems to be a pleasant form of government, varied and without rulers, dealing out its own special brand of equality to equal and unequal alike."

FRIENDS,

Our debut in the political arena of this Country dates from but yesterday; yet, to our ambition even the sky would appear to be no limit! We have been demanding Democracy with its responsible government through representative institutions: yet, generally speaking, our experience in self-government has not gone much beyond municipal government, if that! We have adopted the Indian National Congress as our Political Guru—or, rather the Congress has adopted us as its Ward and Chela—and we look upon its leading lights as our Guides, Friends, and Philosophers—veritable Giants to our Liliputian eyes! In the science and art of Politics and Statecraft we are yet babes who have just learnt to prop ourselves up on our tiny feet and totter about a few unsteady, crazy steps: Yet, we have allowed ourselves to be attached to the Congress chariot whose wild horses hardly allow their hoofs to touch our mother earth—who imagine they have wings and must fly, and not run! Whenever such an unequal combination is brought about, the weaker invariably comes to grief. This is but Nature's law which even we—despite our Great Guru—may not afford to overlook!

The Congress is wedded to Democracy: Democracy has been set before us as our goal: as dutiful Chelas we have adopted it as such. We have hitched our wagon to the Congress Star—Democracy—and have set out on the great Journey, in the wake of the wagon bearing our Gurujee.

We are all talking of Democracy—because our Gurujee has been doing it—but, I am afraid, we do not know much about it. The extract from Plato at the head of this Chapter shows what the Philosopher thought of Democracy as he found it functioning in his day in the land of its birth some twenty three centuries ago. Much of what he said then can be said today with equal force. Democracy has made great strides since: We, who have adopted Democracy as our *Mantram*, have the right, as also the duty, to inform ourselves as to the progress made and the changes wrought through the centuries both in its essence and substance, form and shape. To our immature, half-formed minds, the following extract should prove amply instructive:—

Modern Democratic Theory

"The Allies in the World War (1914-18) waged their final and victorious campaign to President Wilson's battle-cry of 'Make the world safe for Democracy'. Under the shock empires were dismembered, more than a dozen dynasties overthrown, and numerous republics set up. Suffrage was extended not only to men but to women. There is more voting than ever before in human history, but it may be doubted whether the nations are any more democratic, except in manners, than they were. For many countries—Italy, Spain, Poland and Russia—are under dictatorships or tyrannies, ruling in

the name of various political evangels, such as Fascism in Italy and Marxian Socialism in Russia. Everywhere indeed, there has been a certain decline in respect for liberty if not in liberty itself. There is no longer that almost religious devotion to it which inspired the old liberals of the 19th century, who still felt the generous and naive enthusiasm of the 18th century. No doubt this is due to a distrust and fear of democracy as it grows more powerful, and perhaps to the fact that in a materialistic age men are not so sentimentally devoted to abstract principles. It is a practical age, impatient of dreamers and their dreams. As men realise themselves as a part of a large mass they grow bolder, and less tolerant of the views of others: they are ready to resort to any means to impose on others those prejudices that so many of them mistake for principles, and so in democracies there is apt to be a tyranny of majorities, and the protection of the rights of minorities is one of the unsolved problems, though various expedients have been tried, such as proportional representation. Another danger is that within the State and side by side with the constituted authority there is sometimes organised and set up an extra-legal and irresponsible authority, which, by controlling a large block of votes, exercises an influence on legislation and administration unwarranted in the constitution. One of the great blessings confidently expected of democracy was the abolition of war. The World War, fought on the side of the Allies in the name of democracy, was to be the war that would end war. It must not be forgotten, however, that once their interests are touched, or their passions aroused, and it is not difficult to excite them, democracies can be as fierce and bellicose, and often as imperialistic, as tyrants and dictators.

Modern democracy differs from ancient democracy in that the scheme is applied not only to the inhabitants of a city, but to millions scattered over vast extents of territory and bound by common national interests. On such a scale popular government could not function directly, but only by the complicated machinery of representative institutions. The form of absolutism disappeared, but not the thing; privilege is protean, and even in republics assumes convenient or appropriate disguises. The old conflict of interests and ambitions, the old antagonisms still remained, strong as ever, and in the party system that inevitably developed found their expression in various groups of opinion. As civilization advanced, as education became popular, and with the development of printing the mechanical means of disseminating knowledge were carried to a high degree of development, the lower orders demanded larger liberties, and even those statesmen who did not believe in democracy began to use its terms, so that most of the policies of governments in late years have been proposed and advocated as measures in the popular interest, even when they were most reactionary. If modern democracy has not yet wholly become that government of the people, by the people, for the people which was pre-figured in Lincoln's imagination, it has become a government of public opinion in which he had an almost mystical faith. It is in the name of the people that, since the last vestige of the old theory of divine right disappeared in the debacle of the German Empire in 1918, Governments in the leading nations rule today. It is this public opinion that statesmen and ministers flatter, try to conciliate and control, by appeals to self-interest, cupidity and sentiment. The politician has been forced to develop and apply a new technique. Nowadays, everybody, man and woman, in most of the advanced nations has the vote, and there is widespread intelligence due to popular education. Every mechanical miracle of an astonishingly proficient industrial age has contributed to the formation and the dissemination of this vast body of mass opinion. The

printing press with the cheap newspapers and cheap reading matter; steam and electricity with the railway, the steamship, the telegraph and telephone, and now the wireless or radio, have implemented democracy for new conquests. In the democracy of ancient Greece the stentor had a voice 'as powerful as fifty voices of other men', but in the modern democracy the candidate for high office whose voice is amplified and broadcast by mechanical means, can pour his promises or his persuasions into the ears of millions of voters without troubling them to rise from their easy chairs. But rival interests are constantly disputing the favour of this opinion, and in the process the new and unforeseen abuses that are the inseparable concomitant of every reform spring up. The demagogue and the irresponsible and unscrupulous newspaper proprietor have more scope and more power. At the same time there has been a decline in respect for parliaments or at least for parliamentarians, due to a demagogic subservience to what is thought to be public opinion, which may be swayed this way or that by those who control the various agencies of publicity. The old views of constitutional liberalism have been weakened and liberal parties have lost ground; the opposing extremes of Conservatism and Bolshevism have grown more bitter and uncompromising. Majorities have less respect for the rights of minorities. The equality that prevails in the modern democracy is in some ways factitious, a concession to the popular feeling on the part of the ruling, *i. e.*, the possessing classes. But even were the equality real, it does not necessarily follow that liberty would exist. Indeed in the very process of maintaining this equality, democracies become quite as tyrannical as autocracies; inhuman bureaucracies are created which fetter the movements, regulate the personal habits and meddle in the private affairs of the citizen—partly from a natural love of interference and partly to justify the employment of vast armies of officials and clerks.

In the old liberal conception of democracy the individualistic and humanistic idea was implicit; in the new industrial democracy this idea disappears. There is an imposition of mass feeling that tends to standardise everything—dress, speech, manners, even thought. The stamp of uniformity is placed on everything; with the distrust of distinction there is a tendency to mediocrity and dull routine. Under the tyranny of the machine, interest and variety, spontaneity and individuality are taken out of life. It tends to lose its colour and its charm. These are the price of democracy, such as it is, under the industrial system. On the other hand, there are gains; if the highest in society is not so high, the lowest is not so low. There is education, of sorts, for the masses. Indeed, democracy itself is a daily process of education for the citizen. The light of publicity penetrates everywhere; he acquired more knowledge and a greater understanding of the process of government and feels, or should feel, a larger degree of responsibility for it. If more people are voting than ever before, they are voting more intelligently. Women have been 'emancipated' and are taking part in the daily life of the nation, though possibly at the expense of the home and family. Working men have better wages, shorter hours of labour and a higher standard of living. There are wider opportunities of material advancement; communications are easier, cheaper, more rapid: people are brought closer together. The democratic principle is more widely accepted than ever before, but it can triumph only as education reduces the obstacles that nature and human nature oppose to equality. The spirit is more important than the constitution, for without the spirit the only difference between one form of absolutism and another lies in the

numbers of those that impose it. This spirit, this ethos, of democracy, is adumbrated in the old war-cry of the French Revolution, 'liberty, equality and fraternity.' Liberty for every one to achieve a conscious aspiration for a larger and fuller life in a self-governing people's state, from which all autocratic forces have been excluded and in which the power is exercised by all the people; equality by the abolition of all forms of privilege, political and economic, and, fraternity, or solidarity, by the creation of a highly developed social consciousness. This spirit is liberty, vague and impressionistic as the idea is, and perhaps should be, since liberty is a living, growing thing, and not something won in the wars and revolutions of long ago, and placed on file in the archives of the State. The idea of liberty, of course, is implicit in true democracy; liberty is its end and aim, that is, the evolution of the free man. But liberty is elusive because it is impressionistic, as hard to capture as it is to define. Man has succeeded in shuffling off many chains; slavery and serfdom were done away; religious, civil and personal liberty largely won, in principle, at least; political liberty has been conquered by universal suffrage, but economic liberty has not been achieved, and plutocracy reigns in many a democracy. Indeed democracy, satisfied with political liberty, has never yet prevented, or often tried to prevent, either open or secret plutocracy. Worst of all, man is still the slave of his own passions and his own ignorance. Democracy cannot triumph wholly until the spirit of Democracy dwells in all the people. Without this spirit nothing more has been accomplished than to substitute for the tyranny of an individual or of a minority or a class the tyranny of a fluctuating majority, which is no more legitimate than that which it replaces. The ideal of democracy is to replace an authority imposed by the force of a small number or the passions or a large number, by an authority accepted and exercised by the unanimous consent of the citizens, that government of the people, by the people, for the people which was the ideal and the dream of Lincoln" (a).

The Gurujee—Wagons hitched to the Congress Star—

Our wagon rumbles on—the wagon that has been hitched to the Congress Star—Democracy—the wagon that has been following in the wake of the one bearing our Gurujee; our wagon rumbles on: and as we gaze at our guiding Star, we find ourselves looking back now and again and wondering what it was we had had so far which we were now leaving behind us. We are told that hitherto we had Autocracy which we were now exchanging for Democracy: and marking our blank look, some fellow-traveller places in our hands a volume entitled "THE INDIA CHARTER" and points to the passages in it from Castiglione and Plato on Autocracy and Democracy, and the illuminating commentary of the Encyclopædia Britannica on the Theory and Practice of Democracy. We read the passages; our human curiosity prompts us to read the rest of the Volume as well. We wonder and we think: we think and we wonder—Are we on the right Track? Have we the right Goal?

The Barrier—The 'Under-Dog'—The Wagons stand still

Presently, our wagon stops: we see that the Congress wagon ahead of us has also stopped: and on investigation we find that the latter has come upon a DEADLOCK that lies across the track barring its progress! We find the Muslims refuse to proceed along the track along with the Hindus and want to strike another path for themselves. They object to being the

(a) THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA, 14th Edition, Volume 7, pages 184-5.

'Under-Dog' perpetually. We examine the position and find they are right—under our scheme of things they would always remain the 'Under-Dog' without the prospect of becoming the 'Upper-Dog' at any time. Our Gurujee coaxes them: portrays to them in vivid colours the beauties, merits, joys and advantages untold which, even as the 'Under-Dog', they would have as their portion eternally with no one to disturb their possessions: he tells them that the 'Under-Dog' would be assured of his bone and would have perfect freedom to bark away as, when and how he liked: he even promises that these rights, privileges and safeguards would be guaranteed to them by statute! They listen, but do not agree to accept the offer: they refuse to proceed further in the Congress wagon: they insist on separating and striking another path for themselves. Friends advise both to adopt the '*Via Media*', the 'Middle Path', but both refuse to agree, and there the DEADLOCK stands barring all progress! there the Congress wagon stands: there stands also our own wagon!

Is it the right Goal—Is it the right Path ?

As the wagons continue to stand before the DEADLOCK Barrier, our curious minds begin to wonder again. Some one seems to be speaking to us—it is our fellow-traveller with the Volume "THE INDIA CHARTER." He raises his head from the Volume and asks us: "We have been following the footsteps of the Congress: the Congress has come upon clashing interests that it cannot reconcile: what is the guarantee that we in our turn shall not come upon the same clashing interests which we too may not be able to reconcile? Unmixed Democracy of the Congress conception does not appear to have brought it Success—it has brought it up against Failure: what is the guarantee that we shall succeed where the Congress has failed?" We listen and we wonder!

What is it we want that we did not have so far? Our Gurujee has set us Unmixed Democracy as our Goal, with, as our Programme—

representative institutions

responsible government

civil liberties

method of election to the Federal House,

in other words, political, social and economic freedom in the States as in the rest of India. Placed as we are, is it the right Goal for us? Is it the right Programme for us?

The Princes' Resentment

Before seeking replies to these questions, we are bound to take note of an important fact which we cannot afford to overlook. It is that the intervention of our Gurujee in the affairs of the States on our behalf has been, and is being, keenly resented by our Princes. The resentment, we must admit, would be natural: you and I would also resent a third party's intervention in our affairs. It would be in our interests to ensure that the resentment is not allowed to develop into estrangement between the Princes and their Peoples. If the object of our Gurujee's intervention was to bring about an awakening among us, that object would appear to have been fully achieved: we are all wide awake: we have begun to think for ourselves, to judge for ourselves what is, or is not, good for us. The object of intervention having been achieved, it would be but right that the intervening party should withdraw from our midst and leave us to arrange our relations with our Princes hereafter by direct negotiations with them. It, of course, could never be the wish or desire of our Gurujee that there should arise an estrangement between our Princes and ourselves—however short-lived!

What is it that we do not or cannot expect to have under the present dispensation, or a suitable modification thereof?

We see from the Chapter on "OUR PRINCES" in the Volume, "THE INDIA CHARTER," which we have just read, that the Princes have expressed their willingness and readiness to help us along the path of responsible self-government. Of course, the pace would vary between State and State: that would be but natural: but if we had the requisite patience, there would seem to be reasonable prospects that the Goal set for us by our Gurujee would be reached in due course of time.

The Eternal Question

This brings us to the questions we put to ourselves above—"Placed as we are, is the Goal, the right Goal for us? Is the Path, the right Path?"

We look at the Barrier—the DEADLOCK—that bars the progress of our Gurujee, and our fellow-traveller's question rings in our ears again "What guarantee have we that the clashing interests that have barred our Gurujee's progress, will not—if we follow our Gurujee's path—create the same problem for us?" and we ask ourselves "Is ours the right Goal, is ours the right Path?"

As we think over these questions, we recollect the causes that have been responsible for the unfortunate situation in the case of our Gurujee: We have seen from "THE INDIA CHARTER" that it was the eternal Hindu-Muslim Question—Communal Discord and Disunity, arising from the Muslim Minority's distrust of the Hindu Majority, culminating in the demand for Pakistan—that was responsible for the creation of the Deadlock that had brought our Gurujee's wagon to a standstill. We see that in the circumstances of India the application to our conditions of unmixed Democracy as evolved in Europe and America, under which, in India, one community would be doomed to be a perpetual minority, was bound sooner or later to lead to a revolt of the 'perpetual under-dog'. If our Gurujee's pursuit of unmixed Democracy has produced such unfortunate results in British India, have we any reason to expect that our pursuit of the same ideal will produce different results in the States? If we continue to pursue our present goal—"Unmixed Democracy"—it would seem to be inevitable that we should come up against the same Deadlock—the same Problem of Muslim distrust of the Hindu majority. Is there a way out? Or, must we give up our cherished goal? If so, what other goal could we adopt, what other path should we follow, which might secure for us our own Freedom along with Freedom for the country?

And that—of THE INDIA CHARTER

As we brood over these questions, our fellow-traveller, who has been engrossed with his Volume, suddenly brightens up, and speaks again: "Why, here is something which, it seems, might suit us: it is not Unmixed Democracy: neither is it Unmixed Autocracy: it appears to be a blend of the two: it suggests a new path along which, it seems, we can all proceed together—our Princes and ourselves, as also our brethren across the border, both Muslims and Hindus, without distinction of caste or class! Surely, it is a path worth trying!" We feel interested and we examine the proposal ourselves: we are impressed: we examine it again, and we are impressed further: We find that the proposal, on the one hand, provides that our Princes do adopt such improvements in the internal administration of the States as would permit of the fuller association of their subjects in the administration, and in the States' Legislatures through elected representatives, on the basis of mutual co-operation and good-will between the

Princes and their Subjects: and, on the other hand it further provides for the association of the States Subjects in the Federal Government of All-India on the basis of Equality with the Princes and with our brethren in British India. It seems to us to be almost an Utopean Dream, too good to be and yet—capable of realisation! And, yet, as we think over it, it strikes us that its very simplicity, its elimination of the meticulous, fractional proportions and percentages which had been the bane of all earlier arrangements, should prove to be its greatest recommendation: we feel that all that the Scheme seems to need for success is co-operation and good-will: we observe that it calls upon the Princes to make a Declaration of their support: will it be forthcoming? If it does—and who will not pray that it should do?—if it does, what a transformation it will mean for the States Subjects—transformation of their very existence, in all its varied aspects? Will it not mean the achievement of all our cherished aims and ambitions—our own Freedom and the Freedom of our Country?

As we examine the Scheme again and again and visualise its possibilities, we feel inclined to agree with our fellow-traveller in his analysis. As we have observed above, the Scheme wholly depends for its success on the co-operation and goodwill of the several parties concerned, and we feel that it would be in the fitness of things and would go a long way towards securing general support for the Scheme if the Declaration it calls for from the Princes were to be followed by a Declaration of our own support to be announced through an All-India body such as the All-India States Peoples Conference, the Declaration being on some such lines as follows:—

A Declaration

“We, the Peoples of the Indian States, through the All-India States Subjects Conference, having examined the Formula proposed in ‘THE INDIA CHARTER’, hereby declare

- (a) that we accept the assurances conveyed in the Declaration made by the Princes that the necessary steps shall be taken to introduce internal reforms and constitutional changes within the States as outlined in the Formula:
- (b) that we offer the Princes our fullest co-operation and support in all the measures they may take in implementing their undertaking contained in their Declaration:
- (c) that we are agreeable and prepared to participate, and play our full part, in the setting up, and in the administration, of a Federal Government as envisaged in the Formula:

and we hereby appoint to take all the necessary steps and to make all the necessary arrangements in this behalf along with the representatives of the Princes and of the concerned interests in British India.”

This our Goal — This our Path

We see that the Deadlock is still there, the Congress wagon is still there with its occupants showing no indication of a change in their outlook and attitude vis-a-vis the Deadlock: Our apprehensions are strengthened: so are also our convictions strengthened. For a fateful moment we stand hesitant gazing at our erstwhile guiding Star—Democracy—gazing at our Gurujee as his wagon continues to stand helplessly before the Barrier: and as we withdraw our gaze, we notice our fellow-traveller, with a confident air, pointing to the Volume, ‘THE INDIA CHARTER’, which he holds before us, and saying “THIS IS OUR GOAL: THIS OUR PATH”. We remember that what that Volume advocates is not one

hundred per cent. Democracy of our Gurujee's conception, but we also recollect that it provides a *Via Media*—a Middle Path—the Golden Mean—a happy blend of Democracy with Benevolent Autocracy within the States, with all-round Equality, alike in Liberty and Responsibility in the Federal Government, along with our brethren in British India. For a moment we stand hesitant—the next we take the fateful decision: we decide to adopt 'THE INDIA CHARTER' as our MANTRAM and our GOAL, as also our PATH : and we turn our wagon back.

The Wagon Rumbles on

We strike our course along the new Path : the change becomes immediately noticeable. Where we used to be faced with the opposition of clashing interests, we now meet, all along the Path, Reconciliation, Compromise, Give and Take, Mutual Understanding, Mutual Goodwill, which, at the approach of our wagon, seem instinctively to make way for us. We progress without interruption: and presently a new star looms up over the horizon, growing, as we advance, more brilliant than any in the firmament—the Star of EQUALITY, UNITY and FREEDOM—to which we confidently hitch our wagon, in Faith and in Hope.

Our wagon rumbles on. Among the occupants there is no hesitancy now, no uncertainty: our minds are made up. Our eyes are fixed on our Princes: we await their lead—we await their Declaration, with our own ready in our hand. As we watch the Princes almost with impatience, our fellow-traveller with the Volume seems to be unable to restrain himself, and in ringing tones gives us the clarion call: "Why wait for the Princes to give us the lead? Come, Friends, let it be ourselves to give the lead to the Princes and to the rest of our countrymen. Let us be the first with our Declaration. Let us be the first in this race for Freedom,"! We seem to be electrified: in a twinkling of the eye our wagon seems to have been transformed into a chariot with horses that hardly seem to allow their hoofs to touch our mother earth—they seem to have wings—they fly—with the Star of Equality, Unity and Freedom as our unfailing guide—and, as we fly, we hear our Gurujee's voice borne on the winds wishing us Godspeed!

Say, Friends, shall we be the first to place our Declaration at the feet of our Motherland? Or, are we going to allow ourselves to be beaten by the Princes in this race for HONOUR? To our ambition, yesterday, even the sky was no limit! Do we acknowledge any limits today?



CHAPTER IV

TO OUR MINORITIES—OUR 'IMPORTANT' MINORITIES.

FRIENDS.

The terms 'majority' and 'minority' are in themselves simple enough, and what they mean we all know. We are, however, indebted to our Rulers for an interesting sub-classification of the term 'minority' for which we ~~Where a~~ ^{Thesaurus} would search a ~~Thesaurus~~ in vain. For instance, the 'Great ~~failed~~ Minority,' the 'Important Minority.' It is the 'Greatness' of some and the 'Importance' of the others that have turned the question of our Minorities into a Problem.

Luckily for us, there is only one 'Great Minority,' namely, the Muslims. So, we may make no mistake about it. As regards the 'Important' Minority, the classification is not rigid: sometimes the term is applied to the 'Depressed Classes,' at others, to the Sikhs, the Indian Christians, the Anglo-Indians, the Parsees: there is no hard and fast rule to adhere to: the term being elastic permits of its use at will. Our Rulers apply it to one or another when they are pleased with their performance, or when they find it necessary to remind them not to 'forget' their 'Importance' in the Scheme of Things that is India. Sometimes, in our conceit we confer 'Importance' on ourselves, and that certainly strengthens our belief in ourselves. We then think of our 'rights and interests' as being something 'special,' being those of an 'Important Minority' as against those of a Minority that does not hold the meaningful prefix 'Important.' On occasions, our Rulers speak of their responsibilities towards the Minorities—the safeguarding of the legitimate interests of minorities' has been declared to be one of the 'special responsibilities' of the Governor-General under the Government of India Act, 1935—and we promptly draw up long catalogues of our 'legitimate interests' which usually amount to a demand for 'preferences' as against the rest!

At the Distribution of Good Things—

Whenever there is a distribution of the 'good things' on, we of the minorities, rush in to secure 'pickings' from the board from which the Majority and the Great Minority have grabbed all they could. In our struggle we do not hesitate to elbow out our sister Minorities!

Fortune's Favourites—

We appear to be Fortune's favourites. We are declared by legislation to be the 'special responsibility' of the Governor-General. And, we also appear to be the special concern of the Majority and the Great Minority, for we have seen, that, whether in Hindusthan or in Pakistan, we are going to be 'specially' looked after by the Hindus and the Muslims alike! In Hindusthan,

'the legitimate rights of minorities with regard to their religion, culture and language will be expressly guaranteed on one condition only that the equal rights of the majority also must not in any case be encroached upon or abrogated. Every minority may have separate schools to train up their

children in their own tongue, their own religious institutions or cultre, and can receive Government help also for these, but always in proportion to the taxes they pay into the common exchequer. The same principle must of course hold good in case of the majority too.' (a)

and in Pakfstan,

'adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards would be specifically provided in the constitution for the protection of our religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights and interests in consultation with us'. (b)

It would thus appear that whatever the fortunes of the Majority and the Great Minority, we of the Important Minorities need have no concern for our well-being: for are not our Big Brothers and our Pater Familias vieing with each other in securing our well-being? How touching! and yet, how true! We can never be thankful enough for our unique and 'special' lot, for do we not know that elsewhere minorities, however important, live in constant danger of being swamped and wiped out of existence?

Worldly Wisdom?

Worldly wisdom would dictate that in such happy circumstances our only care and concern should be to cultivate our sense of 'Importance,' and simultaneously, by skilfully balancing our 'Importance' between our Big Brothers, to secure special advantages for ourselves in addition to an enhancement of our 'Importance.' For such tactical manoeuvring we would lack no precedents: in fact, we have already become adepts at the game; and all we would have to do would be to persevere at it in the certain expectation that such well-tried procedure cannot fail to continue to produce satisfactory results.

The Census Table given at the end of this work shows our respective population strength: and Mr. Ramsay Macdonald's Communal Award Statement among the Appendices shows the degree of our relative 'Importance' *inter se* as he conceived it in his day. I am sure our 'Importance' was very much underrated by the late Prime Minister, and if we of the 'Important' Minorities play our cards well, we stand to gain considerably both from the Big Brothers as also from the Pater Familias—perhaps much more from the latter as our experience tells us our 'Importance' and our 'Special Interests' are better appreciated in that quarter.

Or Patriotism?

Well, my Friends, what shall we do? Be worldly wise? Or, be foolishly sentimental and try to be a little patriotic? Sounds a bit old-fashioned, doesn't it, this term 'patriotic'? And in this work-a-day world of ours with every one for himself, could, or, should, there be any room for sentiment—call it 'patriotism' or any other—ism you like?

Most of you, who are of my age, would, without hesitation, vote for 'worldly wisdom'; and I have no doubt you would be right. And yet, and yet, I am going to ask you, my Friends, to discard 'worldly wisdom' for once, and cast your vote in favour of 'patriotism.'

(a) *Vide* page 14 ante.

(b) *Vide* page 11 ante.

An arrangement of equality and arguments in its support.

You will have observed from my Political Formula that in the composition of the Federal Legislature, as also of the Provincial Legislatures and of the Local Bodies, I have suggested that the membership invested with the VOTE be restricted to

I				II			
HINDUS 50%				MUSLIMS 50%			
BRITISH INDIA 25%		INDIAN INDIA 25%		BRITISH INDIA 25%		INDIAN INDIA 25%	
CASTE NON-CASTE		PRINCES	PEOPLE	HIGHER CLASSES	DEPRESSED CLASSES	PRINCES	PEOPLE
12'5%	12'5%	12'5%	12'5%	12'5%	12'5%	12'5%	12'5%
		CASTE	NON-CASTE				
		6'25%	6'25%				
				HIGHER CLASSES	DEPRESSED CLASSES		
				6'25%	6'25%		

all on the basis of equality of voting strength. My reasons in support of this arrangement are

- (a) that it places the Muslims on a footing of equality with the Hindus: it makes them joint rulers of the whole Country, with equal powers with their partners but with no non-Muslims as rulers above them as would be the case if the democratic principle of rule by majority were adhered to which has all along been objected to by the Muslims on the ground that the rule by Hindu majority would render the Country a Dar-ul-Harb (Land of Enmity) for the Muslims :
- (b) that it places the Hindus on a footing of equality with the Muslims throughout the Country; in doing so, it does not reduce the majority community to a position of minority:
- (c) that the advantage from this arrangement to the Muslims is that it gives them equal rights and equal share with the Hindus in the governance of the whole Country: they become equal partners in the partnership firm that will rule the whole of India, thereby meeting all the objections of the Muslims and removing whatever grounds there may exist for a partition of the family estate!
- (d) that the advantage from this arrangement to the Hindus is that Hindustan remains 'Akhand,' saved from partition as would be inevitable under the Scheme of Pakistan: that from the 'major' masters in several provinces becoming 'equal' masters in all the provinces, the Hindus lose nothing, but gain everything, the principal gain being the conversion of the Muslims from the position of bitter critics challenging every measure at every step, to the position of 'brothers' with equal rights, as also equally sharing all responsibility:
- (e) that the arrangement provides for the Depressed Classes, both Hindu and Muslim, a position of equality with their respective Higher Classes, thereby assisting in the creation of inter-class solidarity in both the communities, and the elimination of the handicaps from which the Depressed Classes have hitherto been suffering:

(f) that so far as the Sikh minority is concerned, in the Province of Punjab, my proposed arrangement under the Political Formula places them on a footing of equality with the Hindus in the Provincial Legislature and the Local Bodies: but as regards the Federal Legislature, my arrangement proposes that the Sikhs shall be represented thereon in an 'advisory' capacity only, without the right to vote.

It will be seen that the above arrangement, under which the Muslims and the Hindus are placed on a basis of equality, can only be made possible if the voting strength in all Legislative and Local Bodies is divided *equally* between the Hindus and the Muslims, without allowing any other interests to cut in and upset the equilibrium.

Advisers

As regards the other minorities, *e.g.*, the Indian Christians and the Parsees, it will be observed that the Scheme provides that while they are not provided with the privilege of vote, they are allowed adequate (even unrestricted) representation on all Bodies, thereby providing their representatives ample opportunity to place the views of their constituents before the Legislatures and the Local Bodies the same way as they would do if they had the power to vote, and the interests of these minorities would thus be adequately safeguarded. Under this arrangement, the representatives of these minorities would be on the Legislatures and the Local Bodies in the role of 'ADVISERS' only.

A Renunciation—A Voluntary Sacrifice

The minorities affected by my proposed arrangement are

- (1) the Sikhs, so far as the Federal Legislature is concerned,
- (2) the Indian Christians,
- (3) the Anglo-Indians,
- (4) the Parsees.

What would be their position?

Under the Macdonald Communal Award the Parsees are lumped with the Hindus in the Non-Mahomedan General Constituency while the others are provided representation through separate communal electorates. Their representation is comparatively so small that their vote would hardly affect the communal balance in the Legislatures. Nor are the prospects of their affecting the balance through multiplication of their numbers such as, in Mr. Churchill's words, would make it practicable to take them into consideration in any period which human beings need take account of!

Under my proposed arrangement,

- (1) these minorities would have their own communal electorates:
- (2) each of these electorates would elect
 - 10/15 members to the Federal Legislature:
 - 5/10 members to the Provincial Legislatures:
 - and such number of members to the Local Bodies as these Bodies may by rules determine:

- (3) as regards the procedure for the election of members, it would be left to the communities to draw up their own procedure for themselves.

Its Advantages

The advantages arising from my proposal would be:—

- (a) that the representatives of these minorities on the Legislatures and the Local Bodies would be able to represent their respective communities' views on all matters coming before these Bodies:
- (b) that from their detached position they would be able to form fair and unbiased views, and thereby be able to give sound guidance to their colleagues:
- (c) that by these communities refraining from voting, the principal communities, *viz.*, the Hindus and the Muslims, who would have equal strength on all Bodies, would be left free and unhampered to decide all questions between themselves on a footing of equality without the intervention of a third party.

Its only Disadvantage

Against the above advantages, the only disadvantage accruing to these minority communities would be that during the life of the General Agreement embodied in the Charter, they would be imposing upon themselves a voluntary sacrifice in agreeing to refrain from exercising their inherent right of vote.

This voluntary act of sacrifice, however, would make it possible for the major communities, the Hindus and the Muslims, to be brought together on a footing of equality, their numerical strength on all Bodies being equal: making it further possible for them to join together on a footing of equality in the administration of the Country as provided in the composition of the ministries under the Charter: thereby eliminating the not uncertain prospect of ultimate vivisection of the Country: thereby removing all causes of antagonism between the major communities: thereby bringing peace and contentment to this distracted land.

A Call !

What shall we do—we of the 'Important' Minorities? Are we prepared to make this sacrifice? Are we alive to the larger interests of the Country? Do we feel that these interests must have precedence over our own individual communal interests? Has India a call on our patriotism? Does it strike a responding chord in our hearts? Let us put these questions to ourselves. Is the answer in the affirmative? Then, let us take the supreme decision: let us proclaim our faith: and let us announce it to our sister Communities, the Muslims and the Hindus, in some such form as given below: let us help them forward along the path of unification of the Country on the lines of our Charter: and in their task let us, with all our goodwill and our blessings, bid them GOD-SPEED.

An Announcement

As regards the Announcement referred to above, I would suggest the following as a specimen:

"We, the Indian Christian Community of India, hereby declare that we are convinced that for the solidarity of the Country it is essential that in its future Constitution the Muslim and the Hindu Communities should be placed on a footing of EQUALITY between themselves in all respects, including numerical equality on Local Bodies, Legislatures and Ministries,

thereby enabling them to decide all questions of administration, policy, etc., freely, as between equals. We realise that to secure this end it would be essential that while discussion should be open to the members of all communities represented on those Bodies, the decision should in all cases be restricted to the members of the Muslim and Hindu communities alone, the members of the other communities scrupulously refraining from exercising their vote. We recognise that such non-exercise of the vote would amount to the sacrifice of a valuable right : but we feel that such sacrifice is called for from us in the larger interests of the Country and in ensuring its solidarity through inter-communal peace and harmony.

As a token of our goodwill towards our sister communities, and as our humble contribution in the cause of our Country, we hereby solemnly declare that, during the currency of the arrangement envisaged in our INDIA CHARTER, our representatives on Local Bodies, Legislatures and Ministries, while giving their colleagues the fullest benefit of their advice at all times and on all occasions, shall scrupulously and absolutely refrain from exercising their vote on all matters coming before those Bodies under any and all circumstances."

The privilege of providing wise guidance to our Muslim and Hindu brothers in the administration of the Country's affairs would be as valuable as the privilege of wisely exercising our own vote : and the Country's interests would certainly be protected and served in equal measure by the presence of wise, experienced and withal disinterested counsellors in its Federal, Provincial and Local Parliaments.

The Race for Sacrifice and Honour

We have hitherto been charged, rightly or wrongly, with being opportunists seeking to serve our own interests from the differences between our neighbours. The conferment upon us of the distinction conveyed by the term 'Important' has, in these circumstances, been not a little embarrassing, as, in the eyes of our neighbours, it must lend colour to their suspicion. I am sure we are not moved by such questionable considerations. The flame of patriotism is burning within us as fiercely as within any of our compatriots. We are ever ready to do our bit for our Country. If our renunciation of our vote will advance our Country's interests, bring it harmony and peace, and help her forward to her goal of Freedom, we shall certainly not be found wanting. We shall certainly do our part willingly, cheerfully, here and now. The question will only remain—In this race for Sacrifice and Honour who will take the lead ? I seem to hear the answer already as I write this.—

"THE PARSEES, OF COURSE, AS EVER !"

CHAPTER V

TO OUR MEN OF DESTINY—OUR MUSLIM NATION OF INDIA!

FRIENDS,

You are about 100 millions strong. About half this number is made up of the Muslim Depressed Classes. Mr. Jinnah claims to speak for the 100 millions. The above half repudiates the claim, and has declared its opposition to the League and its ideal, Pakistan. You are a divided house just as much as the Hindu Untouchables divide the Hindus: with this difference that while the Hindu division is 4-Caste men: 1 Untouchable, your division is sharper, 50: 50: which makes you correspondingly the weaker!

We Are A Nation

Up to recently you used to be a community, like the other communities including the Hindus. Of late you have discovered you are more than a community—you are a Nation! As your claim conforms to the conceptions of 'Community' and 'Nation' quoted at pages 212-4 of this work, there can be no question about it. The claim postulates you own a destiny for yourselves different from the rest of the Indian humanity, and in right of being a nation, you claim a slice of Indian territory for a National State for yourselves. Again, for the same reason, there can be no question about your claim.

Suppose Pakistan Is Established Today

Suppose Pakistan is accepted by everybody and is established today. What will be the position?

I—In Pakistan

- (a) You will have about half your number (the Muslim Depressed Classes) in opposition to the rule of the other half (the Muslim Upper Classes), so long as conditions of Depression persist:
- (b) You will have Hindu and other minorities on your hands *in situ*, constituting a Minority Problem for you to solve.

II—In Hindustan

There will be Muslim minorities left *in situ* who will look to you for their protection.

Do you contemplate wholesale transposition of minorities? If so, what do you propose to do with the mosques, burial grounds, wakf property and Muslim private property that would have to be left *in situ* in Hindustan?

Else, how do you propose to deal with the minorities in Pakistan? Hold them as hostages?

Safeguards For Minorities

The League's Lahore Resolution of March 1940 assures statutory safeguards to minorities—adequate, effective and mandatory—in the matter of religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights. With the other minorities you have legal safeguards now in India under the existing constitution. Have you been satisfied with them? Have they eliminated inter-communal strife? If not, how will such safeguards produce different results in Pakistan, and for that matter, in Hindustan?

Legal Sanction—Goodwill

For safeguards to be successful something more is required than legal sanction: that something is Goodwill. If Pakistan is secured without the willing consent of the Hindus, if it is secured in the teeth of active opposition from them, will such opposition generate goodwill? If there is no goodwill, if opposition persists, is it difficult to conceive that the minority will always be a live thorn in your side?

The Sine-Qua-Non

For your peace of mind, for the peaceful progress and development of Pakistan, inter-communal harmony born of mutual goodwill must always remain a *sine qua non*. Whether Pakistan comes or does not come, whether it comes today, tomorrow, or the day after, inter-communal harmony *must* be secured at all costs. This is what we have known so far as our Communal Problem—the Problem of Problems—that has baffled us and so far defied solution to our eternal humiliation.

In another Part of this work I have endeavoured to analyse the Problem according to my lights. Broadly speaking, the Problem resolves itself into what have come to be known as Inter-Communal *Differences*. There are some that meet the eye: there may be others that do not meet the eye. The average Hindu and Muslim Man in the Street sees only the Differences that meet the eye. He does not, and need not, see those (if any) that do not meet the eye. These Differences that meet one's eye are, by the Creator's kindness, not many: they have been discussed fully in this work, and it will be seen that, by the Creator's kindness, they are such as appear to be capable of being satisfactorily composed with a little Give and Take. Our Holy Prophet has enjoined on us Moderation, Compromise, the Golden Mean. Hitherto we have been guilty of immoderation, intolerance, and selfishness, the exact opposites of our Holy Prophet's injunctions. **Quadrupeds** As a result, we have suffered. There are quadrupeds and **that point** quadrupeds. Some are known for their sense, others for its absence. **a moral** At times, men are compared to one or the other to point a moral. The horse is known for its sense: we compliment a man on possessing horsey commonsense. So far, we have lacked this attribute: Let us cultivate it now and retain it from now onwards.

Commonsense would advise us to follow the line of least resistance, not to fly head-on against a stone wall: to adopt the 'Golden Mean,' not the extremist's pose of 'all or nothing.' Worldly wisdom would demand that we cultivate the spirit of 'Compromise,' of 'Give and Take.'

In Pakistan, the Hindus would be with you—as a minority: in Hindustan you would be with them—as a minority: and this would remain the position for a long time to come. You would not think of allowing the Hindu majority in Hindustan to lord it over their Muslim minority: similarly, the Muslim majority in Pakistan could not dream of being allowed to lord it over their

Hindu minority. If such lording were attempted, it would inevitably invite intervention from Hindustan or Pakistan as the case might be: intervention, which might lead to anything! In any case, even without intervention from outside, you in your Pakistan would not like to live a cat and dog life with your Hindu minority, every day of your life, which, however, would surely be the case if you allowed the Communal Problem to remain unsolved. Thus it would always be in your own interests to solve this Problem for yourselves, for your peace and happiness in India while you remain with your present status as citizens of India: as also for your future peace and happiness when you become masters in Pakistan.

When Parties Fight

When parties fight, usually one loses and the other wins: and, generally, the winner imposes his will upon the loser: if the winner is wise, he so tempers his terms that the natural urge in the loser for a future fight is blunted: if the winner demands his full pound, he must prepare himself for another fight, and the intervening period would be one of suspended hostilities, not of peace. It also sometimes happens that parties do not fight to a finish for one reason or another, and may see it fit to terminate hostilities and come to terms. In such cases, if the terms are fair and just to both sides, the cessation of hostilities may resolve itself into lasting peace: if the terms are otherwise, renewal of hostilities would be inevitable.

We have so far laid emphasis on our Differences with the Hindus. They have been our Grievances. Uptil recently we strove to get them redressed. Of late it has struck us that with these Grievances in existence, we can carve out a destiny of our own: we can carve out a State of our own, where we may be masters in our own household. We, therefore, seem to have stopped seeking redress of our Grievances, and taken to advertising them to the world with a view to enlisting its sympathy and support to our claim to Nationhood and Statehood. We seem to have succeeded. It seems Pakistan will come, if we are in earnest; it will come tomorrow, if not today.

Chaman or Jahannam!

But, what of our Differences? Since the Hindus will be with us, even in Pakistan, the Differences will be there too! So, also, will the Differences be with us—with those of us who will remain with the Hindus in Hindustan. Do we want to solve the differences and get rid of them, once and for all, or do we want to live a cat and dog life in the future, as in the past—do we want to have a hell in our Chaman-i-Pakistan and its counterpart in Hindustan? With perpetual feuds between Muslims and Hindus even in Hindustan and Pakistan of tomorrow, do we want our sons to exclaim with the Poet

خدا یا چوں پاکستان و ہندوستان ساختی، - جہنم چہ سرا پر داختی؟

(Oh Lord, since Thou madest Pakistan and Hindustan,

Why didst Thou Create Hell?)

Or, shall we let our commonsense assert itself, evolve a solution of the Problem, and thereby secure peace for ourselves for the present and for the future? Circumstances have so conspired that we do not happen to be engaged in fighting this war, on a national scale, due to our political differences with the British

Government.: at the same time we know we can do better than fight among ourselves: our Deadlock and Frustration have left us ample leisure: **A Workable Arrangement** shall we utilise this our leisure in making one more effort to get together with the Hindus, and evolve a workable arrangement with them sufficiently strong to sustain us and carry us on to Pakistan, and beyond?

We realise that such an arrangement is now not a matter of choice for us, but one of the most urgent and pressing necessity for our own present and future welfare. We also realise that it has been our weakness that we have not so far concentrated our mind on the Problem: if we have given it a thought, we have thought loosely—we have preferred rather to leave the thinking to others! We would like to have something cut and dried—a ready-made scheme—to which we could say 'aye' or 'nay' and have done with it. Well, Friends, I have attempted the thinking for you with all my limitations and according to my poor lights, and out of my abounding love for you and for our Hindu brethren, and my abiding faith in the destiny of our common Motherland and her Hindu and Muslim sons, I have, prayerfully seeking His divine guidance, thought out a simple scheme for the composition of our communal differences which will be found elsewhere in this work.

Friends, while compiling this work when I reached the stage of drafting the Communal Formula, I found myself held up by what seemed to me to be an impassable barrier. I have spent days and weeks at the barrier without having been able to make the least progress. I was awed into a standstill when I contemplated the Communities' future in the light of their past—in the light of their present—and I realised the magnitude of the task so pregnant with possibilities for good or for evil affecting the destiny of the bewildered millions about me and the untold millions yet unborn. It was with a trembling hand and with misgivings in my mind, yet prayerfully seeking our Lord's benign indulgence and guidance, that I applied myself to the task—with faith—in hope—invoking His blessings on my poor effort.

You will observe that the basic principle on which the whole structure of my Formula is raised is the injunction of our Holy Prophet (may the Peace and Salutation of God be on him) enjoining on the Faithful unfailing adherence to the spirit of "COMPROMISE"—the "GOLDEN MEAN." You will find that the mode of conduct, both for the Muslims and the Hindus, suggested in the Formula, draws its inspiration from the above injunction, and aims at leading both the Muslims and the Hindus along the 'middle course', giving a little here and taking a little there, scrupulously avoiding causing wilful injury to the feelings of our neighbours be they Hindu or Muslim, and yet strictly conforming to the tenets of our own religion as behoves all devout Moslems.

Adopt The Golden Mean

It is, therefore, the duty of every one of you who reads these Proposals to do so with earnestness and with care, in the spirit of humility and helpfulness. You must remember that underlying and pervading and permeating the Formula that you have before you is the commandment of our Holy Prophet 'BE MODERATE'—'ADOPT THE GOLDEN MEAN'. It is on these mandatory injunctions that I have raised the structure of my Proposals. If you do not approve of the structure as it has been framed, you may make such alterations therein as you may deem necessary, but you may only do so in the spirit of service and helpfulness—you may not lightly discard it in a spirit of vanity and destructiveness. Remember the ground-work rests on our Holy Prophet's injunctions with which none may dare to trifle: it is the solemn duty of every

individual among the Faithful to examine the Proposals with his hand on his heart as in the presence of his Creator, and satisfy himself that he has done his own individual duty in the cause of his Motherland. This he can do by either accepting the suggestions as they stand, or with such changes therein as in his judgment he may deem necessary, and having reached a decision for himself, thereafter to act upon it scrupulously, honestly, to the last day of his mortal life.

A Formula of Compromise—Our Communal Formula

The suggestions form a *CODE OF CONDUCT* for us which is a matter for our own selves—and not for our Leaders—to decide for ourselves. When we meet our neighbours in the course of our every day life, we do not ask our Leaders for instructions as to how we may conduct ourselves towards our neighbours, whether, every time we meet them we may greet them like civilised beings or ignore them like uncivilised brutes, whether we may greet them with a smile or frown at them, whether we may shake hands with them or engage in an exchange of fisticuffs! We know instinctively, with the above injunctions of our Faith as our guide, that our Holy Prophet would expect us to greet our neighbours with a neighbourly smile and a brotherly salam and a handshake: not ignore his presence, nor frown at him, nor exchange fisticuffs with him.

A Code of Conduct Similarly, the Formula provides us with a Code of Conduct towards our neighbours in a few important matters recurring periodically in our work-a-day life: and having once decided to accept it as our guide in those matters, it would thereafter entirely rest with us to observe that Code honourably as would befit men of honour that all Muslims are.

Be Moderate in Thy Pace

If you will examine the Formula minutely, with seriousness, and in the spirit of service, as I want you to do, every one for himself, you will find that the suggestions are such as the most orthodox amongst us can adopt without the least hesitation or compunction. Remember, Friends, you have to live among non-Muslims: remember you are civilised human beings, not brute barbarians: remember our Holy Prophet has enjoined on us 'neighbourliness', 'brotherliness', 'moderation' and 'tolerance': remember as true Muslims, it is our most sacred duty so to shape our conduct in our day to day life that our actions wholly conform to the above injunctions and in no way go counter to them. In our scrupulous observance of these injunctions we may seek and hope to find peace and happiness. Our Duty thus is clear. We are civilised

Our Duty rational men: we are true Muslims: we know our Holy Prophet's injunctions: we know it is our sacred duty to carry out those injunctions both to the letter and in the spirit: we know that these injunctions have been given to us to guide us in our relations with our fellow beings in our day to day life: we know that these injunctions have been given to us to enable us to live our lives in peace and happiness wherever and in whatever surroundings we may happen to be placed.

Such is our DUTY as we understand it, Friends. If you are convinced that my Communal Formula conforms to the injunctions of our Holy Prophet and holds the prospect of producing Peace and Happiness for the Faithful, equally in undivided India as in Pakistan or Hindustan, I suggest that you adopt the Formula as your Code of Conduct, and scrupulously act up to it as men of honour as all Muslims always are: and may the Almighty Lord grant you the necessary strength of will and character, and bless your efforts with success! Amen!

A Formula of Moderation—our Political Formula

Friends, I shall now address you a few words regarding the other Formula: I have proposed in this work—the **POLITICAL FORMULA**.

Whether you choose to stay on in undivided India or to establish your own State is a matter for you alone to decide for yourselves. If you decide to embark on Pakistan, we would wish you bon voyage and Godspeed: and you will carry with you our wishes for your well-being and happiness. If, on the other hand, you decide to stay on in undivided India, we would bid you welcome: and, since you have complained that you are not happy in your present surroundings, conditions, and circumstances, I have, in my Political Formula, indicated certain changes in these conditions, etc., by way of improvement, which, if accepted by our Hindu friends and yourselves, would, I hope, lead to your contentment and happiness.

You will observe that these proposals involve a certain sacrifice on the part of the smaller communities: this would be their contribution towards the good cause, and in suggesting this sacrifice I have allowed myself to entertain the hope that, in the interests of Peace and Contentment in our Motherland, it will be readily offered in the spirit of true Comradeship, and will be duly availed of by you, the beneficiaries, in the spirit of grateful appreciation.

The improvements in your condition, etc., which I have attempted to embody in my Political Formula, will also involve a great sacrifice on the part of the Majority Community, our Hindu brothers. The Formula calls upon them to surrender their Majority at the feet of our Motherland. This great sacrifice they would make as elder brothers, for the sake of their Motherland, so that you, their younger brothers, might stay on with them, in mutual respect and regard, as brothers, in your present household, so that our common Motherland might be spared the pain of vivisection. Deeply as they love their Motherland, I have the faith that they will offer this great sacrifice, willingly, cheerfully: and may our common Creator bless them in accepting their sacrifice in the cause of our common Motherland!

The Formula demands a valuable sacrifice from the Minorities: an immensely greater and more valuable sacrifice from the Majority. From these sacrifices small and great, who will be benefited? You, my Friends. From a Minority you become **EQUALS** with the Majority! From the apprehended position of perpetual 'Under-Dog,' you will be raised to the status of equal partners and joint owners—throughout the length and breadth of this great Country, from the Kara Koram to Kanya Kumari, from Karachi to Calcutta and beyond!

Against these most valuable gains, what is to be your contribution, Friends?

What it Provides for us—What it Expects of us

The Formula provides

- (1) that all that the Muslims may have in undivided India, the higher Muslim classes will share equally with the lower Muslim classes, thereby removing from the minds of the latter the sense of inferiority and degradation from which they now suffer, thereby raising them to their natural stature and status as equals with the rest of their brothers in Islam: This would be entirely in your own interests, since the existence of depressed classes in any

community must always be a source of weakness for its higher classes and their removal by elevation to a status of equality could not but bring you added strength:

- (2) that, with our Hindu friends coming down more than half the way to meet you, you will go forward to meet them, to hold them to your bosom as brothers do brothers, and from now on, march forward; in step with them, hand in hand, as your common Destiny unfolds itself, in the fullness of time, from the Glory that Hind was to the greater Glory that the Hind of Muslim-Hindu Brotherhood shall be in the Eternal Hereafter. This would imply that, if you availed yourselves of the gains resulting from the sacrifices of the Majority and the Minorities, and accepted the status of equal partners and joint masters in undivided India, it would be but fair and in conformity with the usual conception of Brotherhood that you changed your entire outlook and angle of vision towards the political questions of India, viewed them as Indians and not from a narrow communal angle, and generally so shaped your policy and actions as might best serve the interests of our common Motherland first, second, and last.

The Call for us—India's Men of Destiny!

This, then, is the CALL for you, my Muslim Friends. It is twofold:—

- (1) Regarding your relations with the Hindus, in undivided India, in Pakistan and in Hindustan: what are they to be like? Perpetual strife as between cats and dogs? Or, harmonious co-operation as among rational humans, friends, brothers? If the latter, the Communal Formula I have suggested might provide the requisite groundwork: will you accept and adopt it, in your own interests as in those of the rest of us?
- (2) If Pakistan be conceded in principle, are you agreeable to stay on in undivided India on the basis of my Political Formula for an initial term of 20 years, to be at your pleasure repeated indefinitely, until and unless circumstances compel you to break away and inaugurate Pakistan for yourselves?

What are your answers to be?

It is said that man shapes his own destiny. What shape will you give yours, Ye India's Men of Destiny? What is to be her Destiny? What is to be your Destiny?

“AND BE MODERATE
IN THY PACE, AND LOWER
THY VOICE.....” (a)

CHAPTER—VI

NEMESIS? KARMA?

TO	OUR	HAPLESS	MAJORITY	—
	OUR	HINDU	COMMUNITY	—
	OUR	HINDU	NATION !	

FRIENDS,

Ours is a poor country. Millions of our countrymen do not get even one square meal a day.

Ours is a subject country. Its millions are not free men.

Birds and animals generally do not procreate freely in captivity. Humans do. We in India have excelled at it. We are now 39 crores strong!

You count over 25 crore heads in the Hindu fold. About five crores of these are our Harijans:

20 Crores Caste Slaves

5 Crores Non-Caste Slaves

SLAVES OF SLAVES!

Can slaves deserve and win their freedom while retaining slaves of their own in bondage?

Your slaves have rebelled against you: they are opposed to your winning your freedom if freedom is to continue to be denied to them.

Great Expectations

With the advent of Democracy in India you realised the potency of numbers. You saw that what was your weakness was also your strength. You realised that with your numbers you constituted the majority in democratic institutions where the rule of the majority prevailed. In the march of Democracy in India Home Rule was declared to be this Country's goal. You realised what that meant. You came to entertain great expectations.

But the Muslim minority has rebelled against the prospect of Hindu majority rule.

Sub-Slaves and Co-Slaves

Your sub-slaves are opposed to you: your co-slaves are opposed to you: both are afraid of being dominated by you. If their opposition persists, there may be no freedom for you.

The fear of domination could be eliminated if a state of equality were brought about: equality between Caste Hindus and Harijans: equality between Hindus and Musalmans.

Is there any alternative?

Yes. Pakistan. As between Hindus and Muslims, Pakistan would ease the tension. But in the absence of equality, the question of majority—minority would still remain, both in Hindustan and Pakistan, unless wholesale transference of populations were effected.

So, also, would the question of the Harijans remain. Dr. Ambedkar, from the platform of the All-India Scheduled Class Federation, declared at Bombay on 9th May 1943:—

“Placed as they were, they (the Scheduled Classes) had to organise themselves to protect their own interests. They should prepare themselves to fight their battle for political rights when the new constitution for India was drafted. ‘The stand we take,’ he said, ‘is that the constitution must be tripartite. It must be a constitution which will be controlled and worked by free, independent and important elements in the national life of the Country. We do not propose to allow Hindus and Muslims to work up an arrangement for political advancement leaving the scheduled classes in the cold. Therefore, we propose to have one single organisation such as the All-India Scheduled Class Federation functioning all over India and acting as a single live piece to this particular political aspiration of the Depressed Classes.’ (a)

The Harijans would continue to oppose your rule in Hindustan, unless they were accorded a position of equality with the Caste Hindus.

Nemesis—Karma !

You feel you are being cheated out of what you have grown to regard as your rights. Uncharitable people would be tempted to regard this as a visitation of Nemesis—Karma! They might be right; or, they might be wrong. However that might be, it seems to me that your feeling would be perfectly natural and must evoke our sympathy. But that would not alter the facts.

‘If I put India first’—Mr. Amery’s Questions

Mr. Amery, in his discourse on ‘INDIA FIRST,’ asked you to put to yourselves the following questions in relation to the Muslims and the Princes:—

‘If I put India first, then must I not win over to my conception of India’s future my Muslim neighbour who is as essentially and necessarily a part of India as I am? I may prefer a democratic system on the simple majority basis that prevails in England and a closely knit centralised constitution. But should these preferences stand in the way of some compromise which would enable him to feel that his community will assuredly enjoy in the future India as real a freedom and as full a development of its individual, communal and cultural entity as my own? I may dislike autocracy. But should I therefore exclude from Indian unity, Indian autonomy, States which are an indispensable part of that unity and which in their way of life and traditions are the most characteristically Indian parts of India, rather than welcome them and trust to time and example to bring about the changes which I might desire?’ (b)

Karma’s Further Question!

To the above the inexorable Law of Karma has added for you since the following further Question:—

My Untouchable brothers have lost confidence in me: they will not support me in my struggle to secure a democratic constitution for the country

(a) The *Daily Gazette*, Karachi, dated the 10th May, 1943.

(b) *Vide* page 29 ante.

which, they fear, would bring power to us Caste Hindus over our non-Caste brothers: they will not support me except on a footing of equality: should I meet their opposition with opposition and continue to keep them depressed and suppressed? Or, if I put India first, should I take them to my bosom as brothers at heart as in faith, and win back their confidence, going out all the way to meet them even to the point of equality—realising that in doing so I shall be converting into strength and power what had hitherto operated as a source of weakness in the Hindu body politic?

Compromise—the Answer

Mr. Amery has put similar posers to the Muslims and the Princes. As an answer he has suggested a **COMPROMISE**. As to the form of the Compromise, he has wisely left it to the parties concerned to evolve it for themselves.

Examine Your Position

Can you secure freedom for the Country, on the basis of democracy, with a majority rule for yourselves, with the Muslims as a permanent minority? No.

With your Untouchables permanently depressed? No.

Can you secure the support of the Harijans in your struggle against the Muslims? No.

Can you secure the support of the Princes, on your terms, in your struggle against the British Government? No.

Can you hope to get the above NAYS converted into AYES?

The Muslims want equality with the Hindus.

The Harijans want equality with the Caste-Hindus.

The Princes want equality with British India.

Can you hope to move any of these from the position they have taken up?

The Harijans want a 'tripartite' arrangement between

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| (1) the Muslims | } | in the framing of the future constitution : |
| (2) the Caste-Hindus, and | | |
| (3) the non-Caste Hindus | | |

And, as Mr. Amery has pointed out, the Princes cannot be left out from the future constitution!

So, the Compromise of Mr. Amery's suggestion, if attempted, must be reached between four parties

the Princes
the Muslims
the non-Caste Hindus
the Caste Hindus

and all insist on **EQUALITY** as the *sine qua non* of any agreement: an equal partnership as between four equal partners!

The Courses Open

The courses open to you would appear to be:—

- (a) maintain your majority rights by fighting and overcoming each one of your opponents :
- (b) maintain your majority rights by dividing your opponents, winning over the weaker ones and overcoming the stronger with their help : or winning over the stronger ones with the bait of swallowing up the weaker ones :
- (c) give up your majority rights and agree to equal partnership on the basis of equal rights for all the partners.

Which Shall We Choose ?

Which course would you choose ?

Would you have recourse to a free fight ? I have seen recourse to a fight being seriously suggested in some Muslim quarters, the suggestion being that the issue might be fought out on the field of Paniput between 7,000 Muslims on the one hand and thrice that number of Hindus on the other ! and to the advocates of Paniput the issue is not a matter of doubt even for a moment ! I do not know your mind on the point, but if you are for a fight, you need not bother about a Compromise, or a *via media* : you have only to wait, and when the Britishers withdraw from this country at any conceivable or inconceivable future date, you would be free to have as many Paniputs as you and your opponents desired : and, may I suggest that, until then, both sides might call a truce to their wordy warfare which appears to have neared, if it has not already over-stepped, the borders of the ludicrous ? Or, would you try your hand at dividing your opponents ? You have, in effect, been doing this for a long time, but, as far as can be seen, with only local and temporary results, without a general success of a lasting character. It is evident that your opponents look for their advancement more to our British Rulers than to you whom they suspect of entertaining autocratic ambitions and aiming at domination over All-India. Your chances of achieving greater success in this field hereafter than you have done hitherto would appear to be none too bright !

Would you then choose the last of these courses—sacrifice your majority ?

“Hindu capitalists want a Hindustan where they may be able to safely lord over the destinies of the poor classes of all the communities. Musalmans of high houses likewise want a Pakistan where they may exploit and rule the lower classes of the Hindus and the Musalmans alike. Sikhs of the upper classes also want a Punjab where they may comfortably rule and exploit Hindu, Muslim and Sikh Masses, Partition of India is in fact the cry of upper classes of all the three communities. It is not a communal demand as some people think, but a stunt in order that the poor classes may not concentrate their thoughts and energies on all important questions of social and economic justice.” (a)

The View of the Muslim Proletariat

Chowdhry Afzul Haq, the Ahrar Leader, who wrote of the Partition Question as above, ended his thought-provoking little book with the following warning:—

"Muslims now refuse to live as serfs of the Hindus economically, and as their untouchables socially.....We are fighting for the freedom of India and at the same time we declare that Mohammadans will not live as under-dogs of any community or class." (a)

This is the view of the Muslim Proletariat: and Dr. Ambedkar has declared the view of the Harijans, who mainly comprise the Hindu Proletariat, that they demand equal voice with the Caste Hindus in any inter-communal settlement that may be attempted hereafter.

You will thus see what you are up against! Seeing it, would you choose the last of the three courses—sacrifice your majority?

What Would You Lose?

The power flowing from numbers?

As has been mentioned elsewhere, your majority, can only be treated as a biological accident. It cannot be for you a matter of credit or merit. That slaves should procreate slaves *ad lib.* could only deserve the severest condemnation, not approbation!

What would you lose? The power that is challenged and opposed at every step? What is such power worth if it rests not on the willing consent and support of those over whom it is exercised if, instead of bringing peace and contentment, it proves to be the cause of constant discontent, irritation and strife, a perpetual state of suppressed rebellion?

What Would You Gain?

The removal of the dread of your domination, which has been, and, is now, a nightmare to your Harijans and to your Muslim neighbours, would induce in them, in the place of discontent and resentment, the spirit of contentment: and the constant strife, which is now a feature of our inter-communal relations, would be replaced by peace born of equality and brotherhood—brotherhood as is preached by Islam, but which can only germinate and flourish in an atmosphere of equality—equality, political, social and economic.

Can Vivisection of India be prevented?—By Physical Force? or, by Altered Conditions?

You are keen to ensure that our India should remain undivided: you are opposed to its vivisection. How can this object be achieved? You should

- (a) either be able to overcome attempts at vivisection by physical force:
- (b) or, create such conditions as may result in removing or allaying the urge for separation now so active among our Muslim friends.

Can you resist and overcome attempts at vivisection by physical force? Our Savarkars and Moonjes will say 'yes'! I suggest that would be a counsel of desperation and despair. I suggest it would not be in your interests even if

(a) "PAKISTAN AND UNTOUCHABILITY" by Chowdhry Afzal Haq, 1941, page 162.

you could. It would only result in a state of suppressed rebellion, perpetual hostility; it would not bring you peace. Knowing this, will you yet fight?

Failing recourse to physical force, your alternative would be to create changed conditions. You know what change the Muslims and the Harijans insist upon: they want equality with you as against your present superiority. If the result is to be the solidarity of India, its preservation from vivisection, will you be prepared to sacrifice your majority and voluntarily place yourselves on a footing of equality with the Muslims and the Harijans?

What is to be your answer, Friends?

Prayashchitta!

It is a cruel situation demanding of you as it does the sacrifice of your cherished rights and hopes. If the sacrifice is to be great, great has been the wrong we have done our Harijans through the ages: great has been the retribution due: great must be the inevitable atonement and purification—our PRAYASHCHITTA! Heroics have their place and value: you have a reputation for sagacity: you will recognise that the situation in its right perspective calls for sagacity, not heroics. The situation provides a test for your sense of social justice; in the eyes of the world it provides a test for you—whether you love your Country more, or whether you love Power more. By your decision at this momentous juncture will you be judged by posterity.

What is your choice to be?

A Word on Democracy

Friends, before you take the great Decision—Decision on which will rest the happiness of one-fifth of the human race inhabiting this ancient land, I would like to speak to you on the subject of Democracy.

We have been hearing of Democracy in this Country for over a hundred years now. With our introduction to the English language we have read all that has been written on the subject. We have been taught that the highest form of government is the rule of the people, by the people, for the people. We have learnt to look upon the British Constitution as the last word in Democracy, as on the British institutions as the models of perfection. We set ourselves on the path of Democracy, made great strides forward, and came within sight of the goal.

Our Muslim friends have lately felt that Democracy which connoted rule by the majority—the Hindu majority—would not operate in their interests: and they have expressed their opposition to the realisation of the Hindu majority rule, and have thereby created a Deadlock in the path of the political progress of the Country. What is to be our attitude towards the concept of Democracy—

A Fetish for that would govern our approach to the Deadlock? Must we persist in our pursuit of ideal unmixed Democracy of the Western brand? If we do, the Deadlock would be perpetuated. Is there a way out? That would depend upon what we understand by Democracy, and to what extent we should allow its principles to influence and govern our conditions.

Democracy is defined to be 'that form of government in which the sovereignty of the State is vested in the people, and exercised by them either directly, or indirectly, by means of representative institutions'. It would appear that our Panchayat System is the only form of Democracy native to our soil: for that reason it has survived through the ages. Beyond that all we have known is autocracy—at times, benevolent, at times, other than benevolent—but Autocracy,

always. We have known kingship from the earliest times, and it has survived to this day in our Indian States. Even in British India, the government, though democratic in working, is monarchical in form. Our genius is for the autocratic form of government. We may call the head of the State a king, a president, or by any other name or style, but we will always understand and appreciate autocracy. To think otherwise and to strive for the forms of Democracy as obtain in other countries, regardless of the above fact, would be to make a fetish of Democracy and to attempt an impracticable ideal foreign to our genius.

Then, is Democracy to have no place in our Life?

It will be seen that the above definition of Democracy speaks of rule by the *people*: it does not speak of rule by a *majority* of the people. Rule by a majority might be appropriate in the case of a homogeneous people governing themselves on party lines. In the case of India, this condition does not prevail. We have not obliterated religion and communalism from our politics: so, if we were to adopt rule by majority, it would mean rule by the majority community, which would not be acceptable to our minorities.

Rule by the People—can it be achieved?

And, yet, if we want to have Rule by the People, could it be achieved? Yes.

'People' in our case comprises of

Hindus (including their Depressed Classes)

Muslims (" " " ")

Sikhs

Christians

Parsees

Rule by the People, for us, must therefore be Rule by Hindus plus Muslims plus Sikhs plus Christians plus Parsees: and, to be freely acceptable to all, it must be Rule by all the above on the basis of equality of representation *inter se*.

We should welcome and be content with—indeed, it would be the part of wisdom to do so—the Rule by the People as our people are now composed: It would clearly be in our interests to strive to have for ourselves government by a representative Legislature elected by the people on the basis of equality of representation for their component parts, functioning through a Cabinet composed of representatives of these elements in equal strength *inter se*.

Democracy that would suit our Genius

This, therefore, would be the conception of Democracy that would suit the genius of our heterogeneous people, both the Muslims and the Hindus. It may not lead to the rule by the majority according to the Western conception, which our Rulers had in mind when they inaugurated English education in this Country, and which our fathers and ourselves have all along expected as the natural fulfilment of our political evolution of over a century. Yet, if Democracy means the rule of the people by the people, the conception of Democracy in our India of the future, as indicated in the foregoing paragraphs, would fully conform to the definition, ensuring, as it would be bound to do, LIBERTY, EQUALITY and FRATERNITY, than which there can be no higher and nobler ideals for any form of government by whatever label be it designated. The sacrifice that I have suggested to you, which would involve the surrender by you of your most valuable right to majority rule, would win for our Motherland and our fellow-countrymen, along with yourselves, the highest of human rights that Civilisation can offer—LIBERTY, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY. Great as would be your Sacrifice, far

The Great
Sacrifice—
the Greater
Compensation

greater would be the Compensation under Divine Dispensation. *Are you prepared to face the Ordeal, to make the great Sacrifice?*

If you decide on making the great Sacrifice, I invite you to adopt the Political Formula I have proposed in an earlier chapter as the basis on which a lasting Agreement may be reached with your partners—the Harijans, the Muslims, and the Princes—with the co-operation of your mutual friends, the Sikhs, the Christians, and the Parsees: and I have the faith that it will be found to be sufficiently helpful in bringing all the contracting parties nearer each other than ever before in the spirit of mutual trust and goodwill in the cause of their common Motherland.

Our Communal Formula—A Code of Conduct—Mutatis—Mutandis

A word more, and I'll have done. The foregoing paragraphs deal with the Political Formula. I wish to say a word about the Communal Formula. I have dealt with the inter-communal question very fully in the Chapter in which I have addressed our Muslim Friends. I do not propose to repeat what I have said there. I want you to read it and give it your honest, earnest consideration. The question is solely and entirely between you two alone. What I have said there concerns you and applies to you equally with our Muslim Friends. The suggestions I have made in the Communal Formula are for your benefit just as much as they are for the Muslims. It is a Code of Conduct for both alike. Its sole aim is the establishment of peace and neighbourly relations between you and our Muslim Friends, and for its success it must depend upon and receive the earnest and genuine support of both sides alike. Whether Pakistan comes or does not come, Muslims and Hindus will still be living together as neighbours. There have been misunderstandings in the past: they need not persist in the future. The Communal Formula seeks to remove these misunderstandings so that peace and harmony may prevail in place of discord and strife. You owe it to posterity that you do not leave them a legacy of discord and strife. In your own interests and in the name of our Motherland I invite you to adopt this Formula as your Code of Conduct for the future: and may the Creator of both Muslims and Hindus bless your efforts with success, in peace and in happiness. Amen!

**Via Our
Political
Formula!**

**What We
Owe To
Posterity**

CHAPTER VII

TO OUR ELDERS

My respected and revered Elders,

Pray pardon me for the liberty I am taking in addressing these few words to you. I am deeply sensible of the great services you have rendered to the Country, and with the rest of our countrymen I am deeply grateful to you all: and with them all I humbly pray to the Almighty Lord that He may in his infinite mercy grant you long life full of health and happiness, and of continued service in the cause of our beloved Country.

Patriots all

I am aware that you have spent a life-time in studying the Country's problems, and given it your devoted service in protecting and furthering its interests. I appreciate that in whatever you do, or do not do, your only guiding consideration is the safeguarding and advancement of the interests of this Country and of your countrymen as you conceive them. The world has known no greater, nobler, patriots than you gentleman, the high-souled, single-minded, and most worthy sons of this ancient land, whom it is our proud privilege to own as our countrymen, our friends, philosophers and guides. May our kind Creator bless you all. Amen!

The detached eye

You, gentlemen, will believe me when I assure you that in addressing to you these few lines I am not actuated by a spirit of wanton criticism. I am deeply sensible of my own limitations, and I would be the last person to presume to sit in judgment over my fellow beings, least of all over you, my respected and revered Elders. My sole object in addressing you is to place before you certain aspects of the situation in the Country, which you gentlemen, as the principal actors in the scene, cannot possibly see for yourselves fully, and which the **The Man in the Street** detached eye of the disinterested spectator alone can catch with any precision. In addressing these lines to you gentlemen I hope to present to you the situation as it appears to the Man in the Street who is not a politician, who was not born a communalist, and who wants to live peacefully with his neighbours whatever their religious persuasions.

Problems and Approaches

In the earlier Parts of this little work, I have endeavoured to present certain aspects of what are commonly known as our Communal and Political Problems, and your several approaches to these Problems. These approaches do not represent the whims and caprices of irresponsible individuals or groups: they represent the natural development of the various forces that have operated in the Country down the generations, and their individual and combined effects on all aspects of our existence, culminating in the stage where our great communities now find themselves widely separated on the social and political planes divided by what has so far proved to be an unbridgeable gulf.

The People of God and my Twice-born Elders

The Sudras have existed from the days of the Aryan penetration of the Country: the bonds of slavery were perpetuated when they were placed in a water-tight compartment under the caste system. The world has moved forward since. With the march of Civilisation slavery has been abolished in other parts of the world. It persists in India. The world has moved to Democracy: Democracy has arrived in India. Democracy and Slavery are mutually incompatible. If Democracy is to prevail, Slavery must go. We call our slaves now

HARIJANS, the People of God: our Rulers called them **UNTOUCHABLES** (achhuts अछुत), a truer description. As the People of God they have not ceased to be slaves: they are still Untouchables to the Twice-born. Spasmodic legislation may have opened to them the doors of some temples in some places: but that has not transformed the caste-Hindus and brought about any change of heart in them: many of the slaves have sought freedom in a change of faith: we have even heard of a new religion for our Untouchables being adumbrated at Bombay! These slaves have lost faith in you, my Twice-born Elders; they will not join you in your efforts to set up self-government in the Country based on Democracy, because they fear such self-government would be self-government for the caste-Hindus alone where the slavery of the slaves would remain perpetuated. You have to count with their opposition. They have become a Problem for you and for the Country: primarily, a Sectional and Communal Problem, it has now become also an important aspect of the Political Problem of India.

Malechchhas — Kaffirs

The Hindu-Muslim Question is also to some extent a question of "Untouchability." Speaking of the masses, after over twelve centuries of close contact, the Muslim is still a Malechchha to the Hindu: the Hindu a Kaffir to the Muslim. The Muslims, being in a minority, fear they would perpetually be under Hindu domination under self-government based on Democracy. They do not want to continue to be Untouchables to the Hindus: they do not want to be perpetually dominated by the Hindus: they want their own Muslim rule—they want a territory of their own ruled by Muslims: they want **PAKISTAN**. They will not join the Hindus in their efforts to secure self-government for the country based on Democracy. Their opposition constitutes a Problem for the Country: primarily, a Communal Problem, it now constitutes another important aspect of the Political Problem of India.

Divide Et Impera

The third and equally important aspect of the Country's Political Problem is the existence of a foreign power in our midst—our British Rulers. The efficacy of *Divide et Impera* as an imperial policy, which was given undying recognition by that Prince of Politicians, Machiavelli, has nowhere and at no time been demonstrated so effectively as in its exercise by the British Government in their administration of this Country since the awakening of political consciousness among our people, particularly since the opening decade of the present century. We can hardly blame our Rulers for what is after all a natural disposition among individuals, groups, or nations alike, to hold on to one's possessions by dividing the possible claimants. Any other imperial power would do the same: we ourselves, placed so, would do the same. If, therefore, it happens that our Rulers have availed themselves of their opportunities and secured their position in the Country, it is not by blaming them for it that we can hope to dislodge them therefrom. We must remove our own weaknesses that keep us divided: we must gather strength that only unity can bring: only so strengthened can we hope to deserve and win Freedom.

Many Voices

We are thus a house woefully divided against ourselves. We have been speaking and continue to speak with many voices. We have not been able to put forward a claim with a single voice. We have made efforts in the past to patch up our differences, but they have failed as all patchwork always does. The communal arrangement under the present constitution has been imposed upon us by our Rulers as we could not reach agreement among ourselves: it has been

repudiated by important parties ! Yet, we have not been able to evolve another, an agreed one, which could replace it. We have been accusing our Rulers that they do not want to part with power. Our present Viceroy (a) on the otherhand, has specifically asserted (b) that the British Government are only too willing and anxious to hand over power, but they find none in this Country enjoying the general confidence of the Country to whom they could hand it over ! We may not like the taunt, we may feel hurt and resent it, but can we dispute the charge ?

The Oppositions

What then is the POLITICAL PROBLEM of India?

The Hindus demand self-government for the whole Country on the basis of Democracy: they are opposed to vivisection of the Country under Pakistan.

The Hindu Untouchables are opposed to the above demand of the Caste-Hindus.

The Muslims demand Pakistan, that is, self-determination for themselves as a national unit ; they want portions of the Country where they predominate numerically to be constituted as self-governing Muslim homelands independent of Hindu India : they are not enamoured of Democracy : they are opposed to a self-governing India as a single unit on the basis of Democracy.

The Congress demand is identical with the demand of the Caste-Hindus. It claims to speak for the whole Country, including the Hindus and the Muslims : this claim is repudiated by both the Hindus and the Muslims.

The Question of Questions

The Untouchables are opposed to the Caste-Hindus. The Muslims are opposed to all Hindus. The Hindus are opposed to the Muslims. The Muslims and the Hindus are opposed to the Congress. They may all be opposed to foreign rule, but their individual or united opposition to foreign rule, if such opposition exists, is not our Political Problem, nor is it its solution. If the British Government had declared itself opposed to parting with power, that would not have created a Problem for us : It is their declared willingness to part with power—whether such willingness is sincere or not is immaterial—that has created a Problem for us : and *the Problem is "who is to receive power."* Neither the Muslims, nor the Untouchables, would agree to power passing to the Hindus, nor would the Hindus agree to power being transferred to the Muslims with the right to them to secede from Hindu India : nor is there any combination of the Muslims and the Hindus in existence to which jointly power could be transferred. It has been suggested that power could be transferred to the Muslim League Leader who would be able to form a National Government at the Centre : there has been no Country-wide sanction behind the suggestion sufficiently effective and demonstrable to induce our Rulers to recognise it and to act upon it. This then is our Question of Questions, our Problem of Problems—"To whom is power to be transferred ?"

I do not for a moment suggest that you my respected and revered Elders have not already followed the situation leading up to the above Question. There is all the evidence that you have even endeavoured to find an answer. You have realised, as others have done, that there must be some cause or causes that have

(a) Lord Linlithgow.

(b) His Excellency's Address to the Annual Sessions of the Associated Chambers of Commerce at Calcutta in December, 1942.

produced the state of acute antagonism between the major communities that now prevails. I am aware that the leading lights of the Congress have attempted to reach a settlement with the Muslim League, but without success. I have read the notorious correspondence between Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mr. Jinnah, where the former asked the latter to specify the Muslims' grievances and their demands, and the latter replied to the effect "you know them"! Oh, my wise and learned Elders, my respected and revered Elders, what an exhibition of temper, of intolerance, of pique, of pettiness, of frivolity, which would be deemed unworthy and unpardonable in schoolboys, yet over which these our great Leaders have produced voluminous literature! And that over questions on which the fate of our Country depended!

While your attempts at evolving a solution may have been crude, perhaps half-hearted, the fact remains that you gentlemen have realised that our Political Problem really is our Communal Problem, and that the solution of the Political Problem lies in the solution of the Communal Problem.

In the earlier Parts of this work I have endeavoured to present what exactly constitutes the Communal Problem: the declared points of differences between the Communities, and their growth to their present proportions.

Broadly speaking, it would appear that the present separationist attitude of the Muslims is the result, primarily, of their deep distrust of Hindu majority rule, and latterly of a desire to set up a separate State of their own.

* Whether a separate State would be an unqualified boon for the Muslims would be a matter for them alone to judge: and, as will have appeared from the Part entitled "PAKISTAN", the expressed Muslim opinion appears to be divided. Even so, for practical purposes, and sentiment apart, as a matter of expediency as also of principle, the Muslim claim for Pakistan, with all its weaknesses, is yet sufficiently strong to merit and secure full recognition. If the Muslims demand it, they must certainly have it, and there can be no justification for with-holding it from them. The opposition to Pakistan, however, may not be from the Hindus alone. The Hindus may concede it in principle: they may even agree to its being implemented. But that may not produce Pakistan. There may be opposition from another quarter—from our Rulers. *

Pawn against Pawn!

My respected and revered Elders, you realise it quite as clearly as do your countrymen, that to our Rulers we are but pawns on the chess-board, and that our Rulers have proved themselves to be past masters at the game of playing pawn against pawn!

My respected and revered Mr. Jinnah,

To our Rulers, so long as you spoke and strove as a staunch nationalist, you were a force to reckon with. From the moment you identified yourself with the communalist policy as voiced through the Muslim League, you lost your power as an opponent: for, to our Rulers, all communalists, whether Hindu or Muslim, are friends, since, while they oppose each other in pressing their respective communal claims, they cease to be a cause for anxiety to our Rulers. And when you moved the Muslim League to declare for Pakistan, you practically joined the ranks of our Rulers: you assured them that the Muslims would not join the Hindus in their demand for a self-governing constitution on Democratic basis. This is all that our Rulers wanted and cared for, and they supported you. They knew that the Hindus, whether through the Mahasabha or through the Congress, would not agree to your demand for Pakistan. To our Rulers, the Hindu

opposition to the Muslim demand was quite as satisfactory as the Muslim opposition to the Hindu demand: and they supported the Hindus, as they supported the Muslims. You will have observed that in last November December when there appeared to be a prospect of the Hindus conceding Pakistan, our Viceroy immediately spoke of the geographical oneness and integrity of the Country having to be maintained, etc., and the Mahasabha promptly "walked into the parlour" and reaffirmed the opposition of the Hindus to Pakistan! This is a game that can be repeated *ad infinitum* so long as there are pliable pawns available on our political chess-board. Mr. Jinnah, the Nationalist, was a force to fear: the Quaid-e-Azam of Pakistan is but one of the pliable pawns!

My respected and revered Savarkarjee,

The All-India Hindu Mahasabha over which you preside, and of which you are the leading light, claims to be a purely communal organisation. As such, and as an effective counter-part to the Muslim League, the Mahasabha earned recognition at the hands of our Rulers and had the distinction of being invited to participate in the Cripps discussions. So long as you maintain your anti-Muslim attitude, you will have full support from our Rulers in your claim for a self-governing Akhand Hindustan on Democratic basis in the same measure as our Rulers extend their support to the League's claim for Pakistan. Of late you have claimed that in India there is but one nation, the Hindus, the others being mere communities, and you have claimed that the Mahasabha is a national organisation speaking for the Indian nation! You have also been talking of Hindutva, Hinduhood and Hindudom! Our Rulers will listen to you with interest and attention, and may even encourage you to develop the thesis further! When at your last sessions you resolved to resort to Direct Action, our Rulers no doubt must have been tickled appreciably! Such exercises, however, must have an exasperating effect upon your Muslim neighbours and must naturally harden their attitude against your demand and simultaneously stiffen their demand for Pakistan. In helping to keep up the cauldron of inter-communal antagonism boiling, is the Mahasabha helping the cause of India or even of the Hindus? Or, is it just playing the game of our Rulers? Would it be wrong to suggest that the Mahasabha is but another of the pliable pawns on our political chess-board?

My respected and revered Mahatmajee,

You must have observed that after over half a century of honourable struggle on behalf of the Country, the Congress today stands repudiated and disowned by the Hindus and the Muslims alike. Its claim to speak for all India is denied by both the major communities. The communal organisations, the All-India Muslim League and the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, are stronger today than they have been any time in the past: and under the fostering care of our Rulers there is every prospect of their growing yet from strength to strength. There is no prospect of their losing their strength as individualistic communal bodies. The Congress today stands discredited—in the eyes of the Muslims, the Hindus, and our Rulers alike. It has been the fashion to describe our Rulers as a wooden bureaucracy. In its brief spell of power in the Provinces, as in its internal administration, the Congress did not prove itself any the less bureaucratic, any the less wooden. Your countrymen have long observed that the Congress of Gokhale and Tilak, Dadabhoi and Pherozshah Mehta, passed away with the last War. The Gandhian Congress has ceased to be a national organisation. The Muslim charge that it is a Hindu organisation has considerable force. In spite of a sprinkling of members from the Muslim and some other communities, the Congress today is mainly a Hindu body. Its policies may still be nationalist in their inception and may differ from the communalism of the Hindu Mahasabha, but, for practical purposes, the Congress today, in the eyes of the Muslims, is

indistinguishable from, and interchangeable with, the Mahasabha. That is why Mr. Jinnah insists on any approach from the Mahasabha being endorsed by the Congress, and any approach from the Congress being endorsed by the Mahasabha. In the view of many, the Mahasabha has come to stay and must grow from strength to strength as communalism thrives on counter-communal opposition.

The Gandhian Congress Must Die

The tragedy is complete when it is observed that even the Hindus disclaim the Congress! Its policies are barren: they are negative: they can lead nowhere: they cannot win the confidence of the Country as a whole or of its important sections: that confidence was converted into distrust by the arrogance of power that went to the head of an irresponsible and irremovable hierarchy at the top: the Congress has lost prestige: with the growth of the Sabha and the League, it must also lose whatever power is left to it now: it must lose its following: it has outlived its utility: it must die: an inglorious end! Yet, the country's interests demand that the Gandhian Congress must die.

Mahatmajee, you must have reflected on the *why* of it all. The answer is writ large on every page of this work.

In the course of things as they are now shaping, it seems inevitable that the Congress must die: no external props can help it to survive as it now stands. It needs thorough internal purge: it needs new blood: new policies: new men to work them out: the present policies and the present men behind them have forfeited the Country's confidence. They must go, if the Congress is to survive. Else, let the Congress dissolve itself. Let its Hindu members join the Mahasabha, let its Muslim members join the League: let them try and convert these bodies to their view: in the alternative, they might get converted to the view-points of those bodies. In either case, there would be left two bodies only in the field with clear-cut issues to fight out. In such a straight fight one or the other must lose, and thus there would be an end to this perennial communal strife that has been the humiliation and the disgrace of our Country in the eyes of the world for decades on end. The chances, also, are that when it comes to a straight fight between the two bodies, the forces conducive to a compromise may emerge and gain ground, a settlement may be reached mutually acceptable to both: and peace may prevail in the Country at long last. It would thus seem that the Country's interests demand that the Congress should dissolve itself for which step the time appears to have been over-ripe. Will you dare the step, Mahatmajee?

Or Reform It—

Can it be your ambition, Mahatmajee, that the Gandhian Congress may be re-vitalised and given another lease of life—of useful, helpful, life in the service of the Country? You may well ask “can it be done?” The answer would even now be a confident “yes.” Would you care to know the *HOW* of it? The answer, again, is writ large on every page of this work. Remove the *DISTRUST* of the Hindus that has now taken hold of the Muslims. The two *FORMULAS* given in this work point the way how this can be achieved.

If it is to Survive

If the Congress is to regain its pristine premier position as a non-communal all-India political body,

- (a) let it throw open its doors to all communities on the basis of equality of voting strength, whatever their respective population or membership strength, the present artificial embargo on membership imposed by restrictions such as the spinning qualification, etc., being removed, and the organisation being thus enabled to become once more a purely political body:
- (b) let it accept in principle the Muslim claim for Pakistan:
- (c) let it adopt the two FORMULAS given in this work as its creed and articles of faith:
- (d) let the present hierarchy at the top resign forthwith and let it not seek re-election for at least five years.

A Re-orientation of Policy

Only thus can the Congress hope to rehabilitate itself in the hearts of the Country: only thus can it hope to purge itself of the charge of sectarianism: only thus can it dissolve the prevailing atmosphere of DISTRUST and win the Muslims to its fold, the entire community, not a few show-boys only: only thus can it establish its claim to speak for all-India and secure its due recognition by our Rulers: only thus can it hope to win FREEDOM. It will demand the boldest

Win back
the
Congress
from
Yourself
and from
Itself

statesmanship on your part, Mahatmajee, to bring about such a re-orientation of Congress policy: you alone can bring about the transformation: the moment you win back the Congress from yourself and from itself, that moment you will have won FREEDOM for the Country. The Congress may yet have a noble destiny and you may yet prove to be the instrument of its fulfilment. Or, will History record that while the Non-Co-operating Gandhi killed the

Congress of Gokhale, Tilak, Dadabhoy and Mehta, the Non-Violent Mahatma killed the Non-Co-operating, Satyagrah-ing Congress of his own creation? If the Fates have willed the latter, let their will be done. If you, Mahatmajee,

If the
Fates
have
Willed

are not prepared to dissolve the Congress, or, in the alternative, if you are not prepared to reform it, if the Congress is to continue to exist discredited as it is today, the Country's interests would demand that you, Mahatmajee, and your hierarchy kept out of the way: it

were best the prisons held their own. It hurts me to write thus of you my revered Elders—great patriots, who, through your suffering in the Country's cause, have earned our lasting esteem and gratitude. Even as I write this, I cannot contemplate your repeated and prolonged suffering without a pang of anguish. And, yet, as I contemplate the tragedy which finds the Country in the relentless grip of a Deadlock with you my respected Elders persisting in an attitude that has proved, and must continue to prove, harmful to the Country's interests—when I feel that the Country's interests demand a radical re-orientation of your policies which you, Mahatmajee, have so far given no indication of your being prepared to effect—I feel that, if your freedom means freedom to pursue your present policies, it would be bound to create again a situation that would definitely not advance but positively retard the Country's interests: I feel that in such a contingency it would be in the Country's interests that you, Mahatmajee, and your hierarchy kept away from the scene of action—it would be best that the prisons held their own.

It were
Best the
Prisons
held their
own

The Cripps Mission and After

My respected and revered Elders, we all expected that the stress of the War would hasten the advent of self-government in this Country, that the necessity of harnessing the total resources of the Country in a total war with the willing co-operation of the Indian people would induce our Rulers to inaugurate Swaraj in this Country with a National Government installed at New Delhi. Our Rulers,

however, were reluctant to trust us: they offered to associate more Indians with their government at the Centre, leaving the final change-over to be brought about after the War had been won. We took up the bargaining attitude. We made our co-operation in the war effort contingent upon a National Government being set up at the Centre. We were not agreed as to the composition of such National Government. Even so, the close approach of the enemy on our eastern frontiers compelled our Rulers to make a bid to win us over, and a special envoy brought us a special proposal from them which we in our wisdom or unwisdom did not accept, and the envoy returned home. We had allowed ourselves to entertain high hopes and great expectations. We were left with a sense of frustration. Thereafter we have made several attempts to retrieve the situation. We have failed, and those of us who wanted to resort to civil disobedience—no doubt a counsel of despair—found themselves promptly placed behind prison bars.

The Position Before Us

Plainly, it would be futile expecting a National Government now, even provisional, since circumstances have changed greatly since the days of the Cripps Mission: the position of the Allies, both in the West and the East, has improved considerably: there is now no imminent and direct threat to India. (a) The Government have got, can get and will get all they want in men and money for the prosecution of the War: recruiting for the Armed Forces has kept pace with the requirements and equipment: all the material needed has been and can continue to be secured, and maintained supplemented by the American Lease Lend: internal peace has been maintained inspite of disturbances: the Viceroy has in his present expanded Executive Council as efficient and representative a team as any that the Country could throw up: and, above all, the warring factions in the Country have continued to show a pettiness of outlook and failure to grasp realities and to rise and respond to the call of the hour: all which have combined to cheat the Country of the opportunity to wrest her freedom from unwilling hands: in short, under our present Leadership we have once again "missed the bus." Let there be no mistake about it. The Government, both here and in England, can see the above situation as clearly as all in this Country who can take a detached and balanced view of things: and they are satisfied in their minds that the danger that threatened this Country some months back has since receded: that, as far as the efficient prosecution of the War is concerned, things are going on here as smoothly, and as satisfactorily, as could be expected or hoped for in all the circumstances: that things could not be made better by bringing a National Government into being in this Country, even on a provisional basis: and that there can be no risk or danger in allowing the administration of the Country to continue on the existing basis till the end of the War. What the British Government will do and give us at the end of the War has been stated in the Cripps proposals.

This, then, is the position before us, and this is what we must understand. In the face of this, all attempts at seeking a patch-work party settlement with the object of securing a Provisional National Government would appear to be futile, for it would seem clear that even if such a settlement between the parties could be achieved, the British Government would not feel themselves called upon to respond by disturbing the existing arrangements which they have succeeded in evolving and which to them are evidently as satisfactory as could be expected or desired. (b)

(a) This was written in pre-Tunisia days.

(b) See Note at the foot of page V of the Introduction.

We must reconcile ourselves to this situation however disagreeable it may be to us. It would be the part of wisdom to make the best of this, a bad enough bargain: we must put our heads together and see what is the next best that can be done in the circumstances.

Getting Together

The British Prime Minister has declared that he means to hold the Empire together. This can have but one meaning which even the merest tyro cannot but realise. It is that unless he is compelled by the pressure of Indian Unity, the pressure from a 'United India,' he is not going to part with power so far as India is concerned: he is not going to make a present of it to Mr. Jinnah, or Mr. Savarkar, or Mahatma Gandhi, singly. The Cripps offer of Dominion Status or Independence, or whatever else he may call it, or we may call it, which stands now before the Country, will continue to stand before the Country inviting us all to "get together": while our Jinnahs, our Savarkars, our Mahatmas, and their Churchills, their Amerys, and their Crippses, will have been gathered to their fathers.

For hardened contestants that we are there appear to be three ways of 'getting together':—

- (i) Where we may be held together inspite of ourselves by an outside agency, probably by force or show of force:
- (ii) Where we may be mixed up as in a *mêlée*, with the onlookers securely settling down in their seats while applauding the performers with repeated encores:
- (iii) Where we may shake hands and stand four-square hand in hand.

If you, Mr. Savarkar, and you, Mr. Jinnah, choose to engage in a *Mêlée*, the prospects are that you will be allowed to satisfy yourselves to your hearts' content, and at the end of the performance you will still find the Britishers in your midst burdened with the task of maintaining law and order between you two! Do you think, Mr. Jinnah, that the Britishers are fighting this War, without your help, so that when they have won it, without your help, they may make a present to you of Pakistan, in the teeth of Hindu opposition, out of gratitude to you for having withheld your co-operation when it would have been helpful? You have called upon them to make 'an unequivocal declaration guaranteeing to the Mussalmans the right of self-determination and to pledge themselves that they will abide by a verdict of plebiscite on the lines of the resolution passed at the Muslim League Sessions at Lahore in 1940'. (*Vide* your Address at the League's Delhi Sessions in April, 1943). The declaration has not come, and you have felt yourself justified in withholding co-operation in the war effort. Whether you are right or wrong, the fact remains that you have not helped: and when the War will have been won without your help, do you think that your having withheld help will strengthen your demand for Pakistan? Do you, Mr. Savarkar, imagine for a moment that the Britishers will grant you a Dominion or other Democratic constitution on the basis of rule by majority, if you do not carry the Muslims with you? Do you, Mr. Jinnah, believe that Mr. Savarkar's Hindus will agree to a partition of the Country to permit of Pakistan being established? Do you, Mr. Savarkar, believe that Mr. Jinnah's Muslims will agree to live under your Hindu majority rule? No, Mr. Jinnah: No, Mr. Savarkar: Most definitely NO! Will you, or can you, either of you, fight the other, and, fight the Britisher, and wrench success by physical force? No, Mr. Jinnah: No, Mr. Savarkar: inspite of all your sabre-rattling, most definitely, NO! Then what?

any one community in India could gain independence for itself and it is equally inconceivable that independence so gained could be retained for any length of time. If the Hindus and Muslims are ranged in opposite camps, they will exploit the weakness of each.

Wisdom demands that the communities should adopt a policy which will heal the wounds within and obliterate the differences without. Considerations of principle and expediency equally require that the communities should follow the policy of harmony and reconciliation in order that the happiness and prosperity of the Country may be established on sure foundations. If by sacrificing the present we gain the future, the bargain is wholly advantageous, for the present is transitory and the future extends far into infinity.

It must be clearly realised that the Hindu-Muslim problem was not merely an economic or a political problem, but a cultural problem. Policies had divided the two communities, but the political differences are superficial. If they desired, therefore to build up a sovereign Indian State which would stand four-square to the winds blowing from all quarters, they must not seek to establish it on the basis of political compromise merely. Political pacts and understandings were useful and necessary, but the guarantee of their permanence was in the mutual confidence of the communities. Confidence could only be generated when there was mutual respect and genuine appreciation of the ideals which the groups entertain and hold dear.

For one hundred years and more we have been engaged in the suicidal task of building up exclusive organisations of Hindus and Muslims. We had sought to shut our hearts upon one another in the vain hope that exclusiveness will bring us strength. In our cultural movements we have endeavoured not reconciliation but revivalism. The writers of Marathi, Bengali and Hindi have considered it part of their duty to eliminate from them words of Islamic origin. On the other side writers of Urdu have sought to fill it with Arabic and Persian expressions. Our historians have extolled the Hindu period or the Muslim period and have slurred over the common achievements of both. Our artists seek to draw inspiration from pre-Muslim monuments or from Persian models, and our poets sing of the glories associated with the kingdoms of a remote time or with kingdoms equally remote in space. If India is to be built up on foundations which would last for a long time, then this process must be reversed. We must retrace our steps which, in fact, lead us along a path contrary to the genius of our race. If there is one characteristic of our history which distinguishes us from other peoples, it is the remarkable power of absorption and assimilation which we have displayed. But the task which has fallen upon our shoulders today is not merely to continue the work which Akbar had begun, but to complete it in the conditions—economic, moral and intellectual—which the modern world has created.

But the situation though full of difficulties is certainly not hopeless. Never before was India so closely united so far as physical and material aspects of life were concerned as it is today. We owe this to the discoveries and inventions of science. The Hindus and Muslims study the same branches of knowledge and learn the same methods of pursuing the truth.

The Scheme to divide India into artificial states, Hindu and Muslim, would neither serve the community for which it has avowedly been conceived, nor would it serve the country. The essential need is an united action

among the political organisations and leaders at this supreme crisis in the affairs of the country. Many of us who have preceded us in the national struggle have been gathered to God, while some of us who are still in the field belong to a fast vanishing generation. My last appeal is, therefore, addressed to younger men whom I see before me and who are taking interest in the country's struggle for freedom and emancipation to carry on the fight till our full independence is assured. Difficult as your task is, do not despair, for despair is the key-note of failure. The pendulum may be swinging forward and backward, but the invisible hand is perpetually marking its progress on the dial of destiny of our motherland. There is no royal road to freedom. Reverses there must be, but reverses should all the more stiffen your back and stimulate you into further action. I appeal to you, therefore, to carry on the national fight for the evolutionary progress of our mother country and for the attainment of our freedom till the goal is reached."

Dar-ul-Harb, Dar-ul-Aman

In an earlier part of this work it has been mentioned that the Muslims at present may not accept India as Dar-ul-Islam, the land of Islam, because the rulers at present are non-Muslims. The Muslims' desire, therefore, to have their own homelands where they would have no non-Muslim rulers over them as now, but where they would themselves be the rulers, can be understood and appreciated. This condition, however, can also be realised, without resorting to Pakistan, by forming composite coalition governments of Muslims and Non-Muslims, on a 50:50 basis, both in the Provinces and at the Centre, which would secure for the Muslims the condition that they would have no Non-Muslim rulers over them, that they would themselves be the rulers in equal partnership with others where such partners could in no sense be deemed to be rulers over the Muslims. Such a State, with such a Government, would be *Dar-ul-Islam* for the Muslims in every sense of the term. In such a State, Muslims would have full control of, and would be in an unchallengeable position to safeguard and protect their religious and cultural traditions, and have perfect and unrestricted freedom to live their own life as true Muslims in accordance therewith without let or hindrance from any one. Such a State, under such conditions, would also be a *Dar-ul-Aman*, a land of peace, for the Muslims in every sense of the term. Such a State, with such a Government, and under such conditions would no longer be a *Dar-ul-Harb*, a land of enmity, for the Muslims.

An India where the Muslims in equal (not junior) partnership with others would be the rulers of the whole country, would be an India worth striving for—a greater, grander and nobler *Dar-us-Salam* than the contemplated arrangement under Pakistan could ever provide.

*Equal Partnership

The solution of the Problem of Permanent Minorities like the Muslims thus lies in creating a position of EQUALITY between the Hindus and the Muslims without reducing the majority community to the position of a minority.

I ASK THE HINDUS TO AGREE TO SHARE THE GOVERNANCE OF THIS COUNTRY WITH THE MUSLIMS ON THE BASIS OF EQUALITY WITH THEM. Considering their heavy majority in seven out of the eleven Provinces, this would mean a sacrifice of power on the part of the Hindus. But the power that would be so sacrificed would be the power that would otherwise be challenged by the Muslims all the time. On the other hand, by sharing power with the Muslims on the basis of equality, the Hindus would not only share power in

the four Muslim majority Provinces on the basis of equality with the Muslims, but they would also wield power in all the eleven Provinces unchallenged by the Muslims because of the latter's equal association in power with the Hindus. Thus, the constant challenge of one community to the exercise of power by the other would be eliminated: there would prevail communal peace and communal harmony throughout the Country. It would be an act of magnanimity, as also of the most consummate statesmanship, on the part of the majority community to agree to admit the Muslim minority community to a status of equality with itself: and, so long as this position of equality between the two did not in any way reduce the majority community to the position of a minority, the Hindus would have nothing to fear at the hands of the Muslims. The Hindu community, surely, is not barren of great minds who could think greatly and rise above the pettiness of small men. Magnanimity as a communal trait is surely no stranger to the great Hindu community. As Burke has said, "Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom; and a great empire and little minds go ill together." Substituting "Country" for "empire," Burke's observation could equally aptly be addressed to our Hindu friends.

Plighted Faith

I am aware that it must require the highest degree of courage on the part of the Hindus, courage to sacrifice self-interest: courage to trust the Muslims, as equal partners, to deal fairly and squarely by them in the governance of the State. I can assure my Hindu friends they can safely and without hesitation trust the sons of Islam scrupulously to keep their plighted faith and to honour the trust that may be reposed in them: for hath not the Holy Prophet declared

SURA—III—AL-I-IMRAN, (THE FAMILY OF IMRAN)

In the name of God, Most Gracious, Most Merciful

76. Nay.—Those that keep

Their plighted faith

And act aright,—verily

God loves those

Who act aright.

بِسْمِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
 عَلَى مَنْ أَوْفَى بِعَهْدِهِ
 وَاتَّقَى
 فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُتَّقِينَ

(THE HOLY QURAN Text, Translation, and Commentary by Abdulla Yusuf Ali, 1938)

The Fellowship of United India

So also may my Muslim friends trust the Hindus faithfully to acquit themselves as honourable partners in the great FELLOWSHIP that ages to come will know as "UNITED INDIA." This blessed land of ours has given birth to countless brave men and women, Hindu and Muslim, honest, truthful, upright, earnest, sincere, faithful in comradeship, who valued honour above all else: men who faced men as men: women who faced men as men. To trust is manly: to distrust is cowardly.

ARE WE COWARDS? If we are true to the traditions of our fathers, if we are worthy of our forbears, if we are brave, honest, truthful, upright, sincere, earnest, and faithful in comradeship, if we prize honour above life, we shall be the unchallenged rulers in our own homes,—more, in our minds and in our hearts: if those around us possess these qualities, we shall be rulers among equals: if those around us lack these qualities, we shall be their rulers. Such we can be right where we now are, right in the midst of all mankind, black, white, brown or yellow, without our having to confine ourselves in segregated territories, call them by whatever names we like. My Hindu and Muslim countrymen have no need to part company. Both have all the above qualities in the amplest measure. Both are soldiers: both have wielded the sword in the past: the soldier sons of both the faiths are even now winning fresh laurels on the battle-fields of the world. As soldiers, both honour their word as they honour their sword: a soldier readily trusts a soldier: a brave man whose cause is just readily trusts a brave man. As brave and honourable men who have done their part in vindicating their cause, let my Muslim and Hindu countrymen now come forward and shake hands: let them bury the hatchet, sheath the sword: let them sit down together over a cup of tea, and I assure them they will discover that if it was easy to disagree over Formulas of Inequality and Majorities and Minorities, it is equally easy to agree over the Formulas that I have placed before the Country in these pages—the FORMULAS of EQUALITY and FRATERNITY which are synonyms for FREEDOM and LIBERTY. Let you, Mr. Jinnah, declare that you are ready to trust Mr. Savarkar: let you, Mr. Savarkar, declare that you are ready to trust Mr. Jinnah. The Mahatma's blessings may be taken for granted. Young India expects you, my respected and revered Elders, our Men of Destiny, to rise above yourselves: to rise equal to the call of the hour. May the Creator of both Muslims and Hindus grant you right guidance. Amen!

CHAPTER VIII

TO OUR YOUTH

"THE SPIRIT OF DON QUIXOTE appears at a certain stage of every idea, every reform, every discovery or improvement, every programme and every fight for truth or justice. There is always a need for somebody to point the way, to make mistakes, to become a target for mockery or even blows, to fight against the windmills of prejudice, against the sheep of habit, against ill-will, indifference, and the thoughtless raillery of the masses."

(Extract from "CREATION AND CREATORS" by Ignacy Matuszewski) (a)

Sir S. Radhakrishnan, Kt., M. A., D. Litt., Vice-Chancellor, Benares University, made the following observations in his Address at the Convocation of the Agra University held on the 22nd November, 1941 :—

Education and Eternal Values

"Ancient Greece and India agree in holding that it is the aim of education to train us to apprehend the eternal values, to appreciate the supreme human virtues and the simple decencies of life. We must be educated not for cruelty and power, but for love and kindness. We must develop the freshness of feeling for nature, the sensitiveness of soul to human need. We must foster the freedom of the mind, the humanity of the heart, the integrity of the individual.

Indian culture has stood for the ideal of freedom of thought and worship, though there were periods in which allegiance to this ideal was weak and others in which it suffered eclipse. It welcomed the Indian Culture Jews, the Christians, the Parsees and the Muslims. It not only allowed them freedom to practise their rites and forms of belief, but provided facilities for doing so. Its essential aim has been the recognition of universal human worth and dignity, of unity amidst diversity, of co-operation despite differences.

We are demanding a more equitable social order. We can achieve it only if we plan our education properly and strive to eliminate the sources of inequities and injustices. Education is the means for the reconstitution of society. If we are to prepare ourselves for a democratic order, our education must have in view the development of each and every individual, as a producer, as a citizen, as a human being. He must have opportunity to develop to the utmost his innate ability and genius—physical, mental and spiritual. Equality of opportunity is the basic principle of democracy and that can be realised only if we have faith in the dignity of the human soul.

A new way of Life

Graduates of the year, you will soon face the cares and anxieties of life. We are intellectually poor, inwardly torn, profoundly uneasy and ignorant of the future. There are forebodings of evil. The bonds that unite us are rudely sundered by politics. We have a small but influential minority of

(a) "GREAT ESSAYS OF ALL NATIONS," F. H. Pritchard, page 779.

leaders who depend for their existence on Indian disunity or at any rate profit by it and, therefore, feel no sort of longing for Indian freedom and unity. Our one purpose should be to see India united, tranquil and gracious with a new way of life. India, impoverished and harassed, the prey of schism and division, must be raised to a happy and prosperous condition with internal unity and illumination of spirit, where youth will have opportunity and age security. We must cut through the confusions created by the short-sighted politicians and the timid careerists who play upon old prejudices. We must strive for the great ideals of economic justice, social equality and political freedom. For them hard work, self-control, and effective propaganda are essential. Our chief weapons are commonsense, sanity and coolness. The Universities are here to equip us with them. It does not matter if we fail in our attempt, for the meaning of life is not in accomplishment as in the effort to grow better. We must dare to fail before we can hope to succeed. This age has no parallel for the magnitude of its enterprises for those who would be men, and I do hope and pray that you will quit yourselves like men." (a)

My Young Friends

Before I ask you to listen to what I have to say to you, I want you to draw a mental picture for yourself of the man who is now speaking to you, so that A mental with my personality thus in commune with yours, you may be able Picture the more readily and accurately to catch the spirit of the Message I am giving you herein.

From my name given to this work you will have seen that I am a Parsee. I am a humble member of that small Community that has given India Dadabhyo Naoroji, Pherozshah Mehta, Jamshedji Tata, and Dinshaw Vachha. I belong to that Community whose ancestors, fugitive from Iran, on landing on the shores of this Country, according to tradition, declared to the ruler of the land,

ہم ہندوستان را پارہا شیم

"MAY WE BE FRIENDS TO ALL INDIA"

True to this tradition, our fathers have, on many an occasion during the thirteen centuries of their sojourn in this Country, honourably filled the role of mediators and conciliators between the rulers and the ruled and between community and community. I am a Parsee of this ancient Race of Parsees imbued with the spirit of this tradition—"WE ARE FRIENDS TO ALL INDIA."

With this spirit of Service permeating our being, it will not surprise you to find that we Parsees should be genuinely concerned at the condition of our Country today, at the strained relations between the rulers and the ruled as between our great sister Communities. You will not be surprised that this sense of concern should have impelled me, as it has impelled others before me to make an earnest effort through this work to probe the situation in all its aspects and to show to my Hindu and Muslim friends how exactly things stand with them and how, in my view, they could be improved to their mutual advantage.

From the earlier chapters you will have seen that I do not claim to be an authority on the subjects that appear therein. I have contented myself with quoting authorities in their own words leaving the readers to judge them for themselves. In doing so, I have endeavoured to present both sides of questions impartially.

You will have also seen that in the case of the subjects 'which the Communities consider to be governed by their respective religions,' I have endeavoured to present the viewpoints of both the Communities in relation to their respective religious persuasions.

I have great veneration for Islam and its Holy Prophet, may the Peace of God be on him. I am a staunch believer in the noble and inspiring doctrine of Universal Brotherhood that is the corner stone in the structure of Islamic life and a vital precept of conduct the Holy One has enjoined on the Faithful. In all humility I regard myself as being, in essence, as good and true a Muslim as any of my numerous Muslim friends.

I have equally great veneration for the Faith that has sustained through thousands of years the vast mass of humanity described by the collective term "Hindus." While their temples enshrine His various manifestations, He is the same One for the Hindus as for the Muslims, the same One for the Christians, the Sikhs, the Buddhists and the Parsees. To me the Hindus, be they Twice-born or Harijans, are alike the children of Ahura Mazda, and I feel I am as good and true a Hindu as the tallest among the Twice-born, I am as good and true a Hindu as the lowliest among the Harijans.

You will see that in my presentation of the situation from the religious points of view and in the solutions I have suggested I have done so with the utmost humility and reverence for the Faiths of my Muslim and Hindu brethren: I have endeavoured to enter the feelings of my Hindu and my Muslim Friends: I have myself felt those feelings: I have felt myself to be one of them: and through these pages I have spoken to them as a Muslim would speak to his brethren in Faith, as a Hindu would speak to his brother Hindus.

From the Chapter addressed to Our ELDERS, you will have gathered that while I have the highest respect and reverence for our Elders, I have not hesitated to point out to them in direct and unmistakeable terms where events have shown their judgment to have erred. In my view, they have, with the best of intentions, been responsible, in a great measure, for this Country's wrongs and its present plight: I have told them so in so many words. In my view, through withholding the fullest co-operation in the war effort, they have made themselves responsible, along with our Rulers, for untold human suffering and for the sacrifice of human lives, both Indian and of India's Allies, which could have been saved. I hold them responsible, and I have told them so.

You will have thus formed a fairly accurate mental picture of the man who is addressing these lines to you. He is a man who holds no sectarian views, who speaks plain words plainly and does not hesitate to point out errors, who has the welfare of his fellow-countrymen at heart: who is your Friend: and as your Friend he means to tell you what exactly you are in his eyes and in the eyes of the Man in the Street; where exactly you stand: what you should do by way of your contribution if you want to become the worthy citizens of a Free India: what you should not do, if you want to escape becoming less than useless and worthless in the great scheme of things in these great days and the greater days ahead. If you find my words unpalatable, I will make no excuses: they express my feelings and convictions: I am no believer in sugar-coating bitter pills!

In addressing these words to you, my Young Friends, I have in mind the Intelligentsia of this Country, men and women, all who are capable of reading and understanding this little work either in English in which it is written or as translated in any of the vernaculars of the Country: however and wherever they may be placed: all who may be in their thirties, and twenties, and even in their 'teens: all who, though they may have left their thirties behind them, feel the fire of youth still aflame within them: equally all who are approaching the threshold of Life, hesitant, expectant, with eyes scanning their horizon for guiding stars—the Student World of this great Country.

I have said above that in addressing my readers I have invariably endeavoured to enter into their feelings and to feel as they feel. I am doing this now. In speaking to you, my Young Friends, I have endeavoured to enter into your feelings, and I know I have succeeded: I have endeavoured to enter your young hearts, and I know I have succeeded. I have a young daughter and my young son-in-law: I have a young son and my young daughter-in-law. I have a place in their young hearts: I am one of them: my words go straight to their hearts: so will they go straight to your hearts, I know. As I would be responsible to my Creator for such guidance as He may enable me to give to my own children, so do I accept in the same measure the fullest responsibility for the guidance I seek in these pages, to extend to you all, my Young Friends, so may He help me!

As I See You

*Barring exceptions, in the young men I see about me I see a distinct slave mentality, suppressed personality if any, feebleness of physique and feebleness of mind: they are effeminate in their gait and in their talk. In these young men I can discern shallowness: narrow vision: readiness to accept without question the opinions of others: little judgment: hardly any will: hardly any manliness.

A more depressed and submerged specimen of humanity it would be difficult to come across. And, yet, it is in the hands of this Youth as a class, such as it is, that the Destiny of this Country rests!

I do not blame you, my Young Friends, if you are such as I have described you above.* It is not your fault. It is the heritage you have received from generations that had not only lost their Freedom but lost also all sense of Freedom and its ennobling attributes. It is not my purpose here to attempt to fix responsibility for this unhappy state of things. It should be our purpose, yours and mine, to seek ways and means of improving the situation.

Our Politicians

You hear people about you talking of Freedom and the inner urge in you draws you to them. They call themselves, and so people call them, Politicians. Usually, they are an irresponsible crowd, parrot-wise repeating slogans, ill-qualified and ill-equipped to discuss political questions, but if they happen to be endowed with the gift of the gab, they are sure to secure a following for themselves. Their following, more often than not, is drawn from the simple-minded, undiscerning, immature and unquestioning Youth around them.

To your young minds the term "Politics" has a great fascination. You are attracted by the political movements around you: you are attracted by the political leaders around you or those who pass themselves off as such. You may or may not understand either the movements or the leaders. Yet, you think and feel these have a call for you, that your young lives are incomplete unless you join the movements and follow the leaders! You do not pause to judge the merits of the movements or of the leaders. In most cases you are not sufficient!

equipped to exercise such judgment. You are attracted to movements and leaders as your mood or fancy leads you. The result usually is that you, my Young Friends, find yourselves attached to this or that movement and this or that leader, and find strange dogmas and beliefs, truths and half-truths, half-baked principles and policies thrust upon you to the exclusion of your judgment and freedom of thought and action.

Their Followings

The audiences and the followings of these leaders usually comprise of two classes, (a) those still at their schools and colleges and (b) those who may have left these behind them and entered upon life, but may yet be not far advanced from its threshold: men and women in their twenties and thirties: both classes comprising, for my purpose, the general group I have addressed above as my "Young Friends". Both, usually, are as simple-minded, immature and undiscerning, as the "Politicians" before them may be irresponsible, ill-equipped and illqualified. I shall address myself to each of these two classes separately. I shall speak to the Students first.

You Belong to me and I Belong to you !

Addressing the All-India Muslim Students Conference at Jullunder on the 16th November 1942, Mr. Jinnah, in the course of his address, warned the Muslim Students that while they were students, they should prepare themselves for, and not take active part in, the political struggle now going on in the Country: that they should organise Muslim students in India into a compact body to safeguard their interests, undertake constructive programme for social, economic and educational uplift of the Muslim community and popularise Islamic culture and studies and encourage better understanding and goodwill between the various nationalities of India. (a) Two days later, addressing the students at Lyallpur, on the 18th November 1942, Mr. Jinnah said "You belong to me, and I belong to you. Let us march together, and we shall win." (b) I can imagine Mr. Savarkar addressing a gathering of Hindu students in the same strain, in the same words !

You will observe that Mr. Jinnah claims you as "belonging" to him, that is, to his organisation, the Muslim League and the principles for which the League stands. So would Mr. Savarkar claim the Hindu students as "belonging" to him, his Sabha, and the principles for which the Sabha stands. The claim implies that they both need your support. They know that your unsophisticated young hearts would readily flow out to the Great Leaders, and, full of enthusiasm for the great Cause, as you imagine it, as it has been depicted to you by these Leaders, you would flock to their respective banners with shouts on your lips of "Muslim League, Zinda Bad", "Mahasabha-Ki-Jai". Thus, the much needed fresh blood would be secured to invigorate the old bodies to sustain them in their slow, painful march in the communal ruts.

Not Fair of them

I do not think these great Leaders are fair to you, my Young Friends, in thus appealing to your generous impulses for the propagation of their narrow communal ends. You are not bound by party allegiances, you are not fettered by dogmas, prejudices, superstitions, the narrow enclosed outlook of a frog in a well. It is your privilege, the privilege of Youth, that there are no bounds to your

- (a) Associated Press Message as published in the *Daily Gazette*, Karachi, dated 17th November 1942.
- (b) Associated Press Message as published in the *Daily Gazette*, Karachi, dated 19th November 1942.

imagination, your hopes, your ambitions: the whole of India is yours: the whole World is yours: the whole Universe is yours. Yours is a country-wide, a continent-wide, Brotherhood, a world-wide Brotherhood! What a grand vista meets the eye of Youth! What is a Hindu, a Muslim, a Sikh, a Christian, or a Parsee, in such universal brotherhood! What is a province, what is a country, what is Hindustan, what is Pakistan, what is Khalistan, what is Dravidastan, in such a world vista! In the brotherhood of Free Men the world over, with momentous problems before you affecting the permanent good of all humanity, what is a Muslim League or a Hindu Sabha, what is proportion in Services or representation in Councils, what is a seat here or a job there, what is music before mosques or cow protection, what is Hindi or Urdu, what is this or that national song, what is a Jinnah, or a Savarkar, or a Gandhi? My Young Friends, the World is yours, the Universe is yours: your vision must know no bounds lateral or vertical. Since God in His wisdom has given you birth in this ancient land of India, you are born an Indian: that you are born to Hindu or Muslim parents is a mere accident: it only indicates the road you would follow in your journey through life eventually to meet your Creator: that does not prescribe or circumscribe your mode of conduct towards your neighbours of persuasions other than your own: wherever you are placed, whoever may be your neighbours, whatever your surroundings, remember you are a part, a small but none-the-less vital part, of the greatest and the most glorious organisation in the world—the Brotherhood of Man. Act, therefore, as Men, as broad-minded, long-visioned, large-hearted, rational men, not as narrow-minded, narrow-visioned, bigots: act as brothers: act as Free men in a Free world: only thus you will qualify and be worthy of Freedom, only thus you will win Freedom.

Your Answer

Your answer, then, to the League and Sabha Leaders who may woo you for support saying "you belong to me as I belong to you", would and should be:—

"YOUR EXCELLENCIES, we are proud to belong to you and to have you belong to us. We certainly belong to each other. But, both you and each one of us belong to a greater entity—India. You and we are Indians and must remain Indians, not mere Hindustanis or Pakistanis. We do not believe in separate homelands which would mean segregation and isolation usually prescribed as a precaution against the spread of disease. They cannot cure disease. Freedom cannot grow and develop to its full stature within compressed bounds. We do not believe in a numerical majority which is only a biological accident. We do not believe in Untouchability which is a crime against humanity. We believe in equality between man and man. We believe in equal rights and opportunities as also equal responsibilities for all Indians in all India whether we are born in the Punjab or Bombay, in Sind or Madras, whatever the pigment of our skins, whether we speak Hindi or Urdu, English or Esperanto, whether we seek our God in a mosque, a temple, or in the wide open expanses of His earth if entry to His temples be denied to us by His twice-born devotees! We want to develop our character, our manhood, our nationalism, our humanity, freely without any territorial limitations. We want to live our lives as civilised men free from petty communal jealousies and squabbles, lives enriched not by Muslim culture alone, not by Hindu culture alone, but by the happy fusion of both with world culture.

THIS IS OUR VISION, THIS OUR GOAL. We know, this is not the Vision, this is not the Goal, of the communal organisations over which Your Excellencies preside. With the incompatibility of our respective

Visions and our Goas, we feel there can be no common meeting ground for you and for us: the League and the Sabha certainly do not provide such common meeting ground. We feel and hope, however, that the present moods and policies of the League and the Sabha are but a passing phase if abnormal, and that when it has passed, it will be possible, with the return of normalcy, for you and us to have a common Vision and a common Goal—a United India. It will then be our good fortune as also our proud privilege to be able to hail you, Mr. Jinnah, and you, Mr. Savarkar, not as a great Muslim, or a great Hindu, but as Great Indians, great sons of a great Country—United India. Until then, we feel it would only be fair that you gentlemen did not seek to gather us into your folds, it would only be honest of you if you gentlemen allowed us to stand out."

I shall now speak to those of you my Young Friends who are no longer approaching the threshold of Life, who have crossed it and left it behind you, who yet have not advanced so far as to have lost all touch with Youth, in whom the generous glow and vigour, the freshness, the hope, the trust, and the faith of Youth have not faded yet, on whom narrow vision, distrust, and disharmony, the crust of crusted dogmas, the unreason of a perverse mind, the zid born of pettiness, have not yet cast their lengthening shadows—you men and women in your twenties and thirties, the class to which my own children belong. My Young Friends, yours is a special responsibility. While the responsibility for leading or misleading our Younger Friends rests with our Elders, the responsibility in your case rests entirely with you alone. Yours must be a keener perception and a maturer judgment than may be expected in our Younger Friends. Our Elders no doubt want your support to their policies and programmes: but to extend it to them or to withhold it must rest with you. You must realise, as they do, that their organisations, the League and the Mahasabha, must languish and perish without the infusion of new blood. You must judge for yourselves whether their policies and programmes are such as would advance the interests of our Country. If you judge they are, they must deserve and receive your support. If you judge they are not, to support them against your convictions would be an unpardonable sin against your Country, your countrymen, and against all humanity. It is a test of your judgment, of your manhood, of your fitness for Freedom. You have before you ample material in this work to enable you to form your judgment. As rational men, you must evaluate the evidence of the facts before you, and having done so, you must form and declare your judgment to the world. If you find that the League and the Sabha on their present policies and programmes deserve your support, go forward and join them. If your verdict is against them, declare it from the house-tops so that your Elders and the world may know where and for what Young India stands. If you happen to have already joined these bodies, sever your connection with them at once. These bodies are filled with men who are too far advanced in life to be able to respond to new currents of thought and are too deeply imbued with the communal bias to be able to shed it at the mere contact with Youth. Even if you were to attempt to swamp them with your numbers, the fact that their executives hold office practically for life would make it impossible for you to get them to adopt your non-communal programmes and policies: the danger rather would be that their sinister influences might succeed in weakening your strength and they might succeed in absorbing you amongst them! So you would be best advised to sever your connection with them. If it happens that you have not joined them so far, keep away from them and let them meet their natural end in God's own good time.

Think For Yourselves, Then Act

The most vitally important thing for you to do at this juncture, your most solemn duty towards your Country at this moment, is that you should think, think

for yourselves, think very hard, every man and woman among you, think independently of the opinions of your Elders, your equals, your friends, your opponents: regardless— even of what I, your most sincere friend and well-wisher, say to you: *think for yourselves, and then act.* The trouble with our Country has been that there are just a few people who do the thinking according to their lights: there are many who do the talking, often loosely, irresponsibly: the rest of the Indian humanity sheeplike follow where the blatant voices lead them, more often than not, into the ditch. There have been more ditches, more deadlocks, in this unhappy Country than in all the rest of the world put together, only because there are proportionately more sheeplike people here than elsewhere, who have been content to be led into ditches or against deadlocks. It is time, you, my Young Friends, ceased to be mere sheep: it is time you awoke to a sense of your manhood and womanhood, to a sense of your responsibility as rational human beings, responsibility as citizens of a great Country whose future for good or evil rests entirely in your hitherto untried hands.

Your Armour

India's hope rests solely in you, her Youth: not the Muslim Youth, not the Hindu Youth, not the Harijan Youth—types such as we have known so far—may these types as such soon find themselves relegated to oblivion: may they be no more than an unhappy memory of an unhappy past, to be found perchance, if at all, only in museums of quaint antiquities. At this critical juncture, India's hope rests solely in you, her Youth, the *Indian Youth*, Youth—man and woman—who, out of your convictions, can tell your Elders that you have sufficiently advanced beyond the mere animal stage to a stage where you do not need a Muslimistan, or a Hindustan, or a Dravidistan, or a Khalistan, or any other water-tight, segregated territorial compartments, for the safety and well-being of your bodies and souls: Indian Youth—man and woman—who, whatever the creed or religious denomination in which you happen to have been born, have acquired enough confidence in yourselves and in your brothers and sisters around you to be able to feel that you can live with and among your neighbours in perfect amity and concord, your only protecting armour against yourselves, against your neighbours, and against the world, being your proud status, the status of a *Citizen of United India*.

This glorious vision can be realised, not in the distant future, but in the immediate present. Eliminate the causes that have hitherto operated to keep aloof Youth from Youth, establish between Youth and Youth a spirit of mutual confidence and trust, amity and concord: not as a measure of expediency, but out of sincere conviction of your hearts: the moment this is done, that moment communal discord will disappear: that moment your Country will stand liberated, a Free Country, a Country of Free Men and Women.

In the foregoing chapters you will find two Constructive Programmes which I have specially drawn up for you my Young Friends. The first, the Communal Formula (Part V, Chapter 8) is intended for adoption by *all* of you, whether you are approaching the threshold of Life or have already crossed it. The second, the Political Formula, (the rest of Part V), is intended for those of you who have left your schools and colleges, and entered upon Life's struggle.

To those at Schools and Colleges.

To those of you who are at schools and colleges, I would say in Mr. Jinnah's words "while you are students, you should prepare yourselves for, and not take active part in, the political struggle now going on in the Country." I have observed that some of you have at times resorted to striking work,

picketing school and college gates, and parading the streets. It no doubt gave you the satisfaction of feeling that you were participating in the Country's struggle. You were wrong, my Friends. You were merely harming your own interests without helping in the struggle in any way at all. You would serve the Country best by pursuing your studies and preparing yourselves for the struggle ahead. You could help the Country, even while pursuing your studies, by adopting my Communal Formula, adopting it as your article of faith, and endeavouring to spread its message among those around you, and to give effect to its several provisions to the honest best of your individual capacity. It would be missionary work of the highest order, and you would deserve well of your grateful Country. I commend it to you, my Young Friends, for adoption and unremitting execution from the moment you have read these pages to the last day of your mortal life.

To those who have entered upon Life's Struggle.

To those of you who have left schools and colleges and have entered upon Life's struggle, I would, in addition to the Communal Formula, recommend the adoption also of the Political Formula. The latter Formula speaks for itself : my only further advice to you would be

- (a) Don't join any of the existing organisations, either
 - (i) The Indian National Congress
 - (ii) The All-India Muslim League
 - (iii) The All-India Hindu Mahasabha
 or any other similar communal body.
- (b) Don't let members of any of the above or other similar bodies join you.
- (c) Form your own organisations, purely political, such as, for instance,
 - I — National Conservatives
 - II — National Progressivists
 with purely political, economic and social programmes entirely divorced of communalism in any shape or form : and fight all elections on the political tickets of such bodies.

Very Much to the Point—Military Careers

Before closing this Chapter, it would not be out of place—in my opinion — it would be very much to the point—to quote here a passage from the Address delivered by Mr. Panna Lall, M.A., B.Sc., LL.B. (Cantab), D. Litt., Bar-at-Law, C. I. E., I. C. S., at the Convocation of the University of Allahabad held on the 15th November 1941 :—

“Military Careers—One of these avenues, which I should like to mention prominently, is that of military service, technical and non-technical. If our country is to be adequately protected against external aggression, the future Indian army will, according to modern standards, be of vastly greater numbers. Even if we put it at a million, the number of commissioned officers will alone be very large. The State has a right to look to the Universities to supply this material, and it will fully tax their resources to provide so many men with the requisite standard of training and character. The Universities will have to take academic notice of this new order of things and to adjust and expand their curricula to suit the new demand. You

will recall the words of the Asquith Commission and the vista of the subject of future study held forth by them. These indicate the kind of changes which our Universities will have to make if our graduates are to take their legitimate part in society as leaders of men. It remains for you, young men, to supply your contribution—ambition, effort, courage.

I was sorely distressed to read in a document issued by one of our most responsible State officials, who is entrusted with the duty of selecting University men for the Army, that even among those possessing the necessary educational and physical standards there is apparent a lack of courage. This is attributed partly to an absence of military traditions in the recent past, which deprives us of the necessary stimulus; but, if this is so, it creates a vicious circle which we must cut by deliberately choosing these careers now and thus re-creating the traditions for our successors.

What, however, makes me hang down my head in shame is that some of our young men should have taken refuge in the plea that their mothers and sisters were both to let them go into the Army. This is a gross libel on the fair name of the women of India. Did Kunti and Gandhari ever keep back their sons from the battlefield? And did not our women themselves take their proper share in military duties? The renowned Bharat sculptures remind us of the skilful horsewomen in the Army. Patanjali mentions the Saktikis—the spear-bearers. Megasthenes stands testimony to the Amazonian body-guard of the Maurya Emperor, Chandra Gupta. Kautilya speaks equally of the part played by the women archers and, to come to more recent times, did not Durgavati, Chand Bibi, and Lakshmibai remain undaunted before overwhelming odds? So far as courage—physical or moral—goes, I will say here without fear of contradiction that the women of India—Hindu or Muslim—have never been found wanting, either in the past or today. Why should you young men then be found so lacking in this manly virtue? Might I ask you Krishna's question?

"Whence has this dejection befallen thee in this perilous strait, ignoble, heaven-losing, infamous, un-Aryan, O Arjuna?"

We have to make up our minds here and now, once and for all, to give up this un-Aryan weakness an offer to Mother India an army of heroic sons. If there be any amongst the young men here so lacking in red blood corpuscles as to quail at this prospect, I would say to the women here—"Women of India, Favour them not!" (a)

To those who hear the Call

To those of you, my Young Friends, whether at school or at college, or outside them, who feel that in these strenuous times when the whole world is at war, where men kill and are being killed in their tens of millions, where great cities are being bombed out of existence, where Civilisation itself is at stake, where Freedom is threatened with extinction, to those of you, my Young Friends, who feel that in times like these it is your part that you should do more than merely pursue your studies or your usual vocations, who feel that this world struggle affects you just as much as it affects others, who feel that at this juncture it is your duty to humanity to suborn your personal and even your Country's interests to the world causes of Justice, Liberty and Freedom that are at stake, who feel a call that you must do your part in this struggle for human

freedom and Civilization,—to such of you, my Young Friends, I would say “You are right: I respect your honest instincts: I agree with you that your duty today does not begin and end in pursuing your studies, your vocations, your politics: your duty today is to join the forces of Civilization against the forces of darkness: it would be immoral and cowardly to stand aside because the fight was not started with your consent: the fight is there: it is on: none can afford to stand by: we must join in immediately: those of you who are fit for agricultural work, go and work on the fields and grow more food: those of you who have technical skill, go and join the munitions factories: those of you who can fight, go and join the fighting forces: there is room and there is work for every one of you in this mighty struggle which is a struggle for life for us as much as for any one else: go forth and join in the Country’s war effort, go and join in in your hundreds of thousands.”

My Young Friends, in giving you the above advice I have regarded myself and felt myself *in loco parentis* towards you, and have given you this advice as a parent would to his children, after mature consideration and careful weighing of all the factors that govern this Country’s life today. I have sent forth my only son, I have also sent forth the husband of my only daughter, both of your age, to join the fighting forces, and I am proud to say that I had the fullest support from my daughter, my daughter-in-law and the mother of my children, as also the parents of my daughter-in-law and of my son-in-law: God bless them all: I am giving you the above advice, not as one who has not dared to act on it himself, but as one who has acted on what he preaches to others: I am advising you as above as I have advised my own children. You can therefore fully trust me to give you the right advice. I say to you again, “Go forth and join the Forces in your hundreds of thousands, and prove yourselves worthy of Freedom, worthy sons and daughters of the Free India of our dreams”: and may He bless your arms with Victory.

Respond Like Men

Yours is a high and noble Destiny, my Young Friends. You are the heirs to a renowned past: it is given to you to be the founders of a glorious future. This ancient land has given birth to great thinkers, great sages, great law-givers, great poets, great philosophers, great warriors, great men and great women in all walks of life, great Muslims, great Hindus, great Sikhs, great Parsees. Let it not be said that the days of her glory are gone for ever: let it not be said that the greatness of the past has no counterpart in the present. By our deeds of valour on the battle-fields of the world, as by the honest sweat of our brow in the factories and on the farms, let us create new traditions, worthy of our past, worthy of our future: let us add fresh lustre to our escutcheons: let us raise this our ancient land to new heights of glory: let us in this fateful hour *unite* and respond to this call of Duty: **respond like men**: and let us by our deeds render our land a worthy home for Freedom to enter and live in. Thus alone can India be Free. You alone, my Young Friends, can win that Freedom.

CHAPTER IX

A SUMMING UP

A Summing up—

As my readers will have observed, this work has treated its subject in relation to

I—YESTERDAY

II—TODAY

III—TOMORROW

We have noticed the birth and growth of political consciousness in the Country: the growth of political institutions and organisations such as the Congress, the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha, and their creeds: we have noticed the Constitutional development from the inception of local self-government to the goal for India envisaged by Britain, namely, Dominion Status, and the demand for Independence, the goal envisaged for India by the Indians.

We have noticed the DEADLOCK and its causes: among these we have noticed the Communal Differences between the Hindus and the Muslims: we have also noticed the Political Differences between them.

We have examined in detail what constitute the Communal Differences. These relate to

- (1) The Cow question,
- (2) the Azan, or the Muslim Call to Prayer,
- (3) Music before Mosques,
- (4) the Language question, including Education and Educational Institutions,
- (5) the National Anthem,
- (6) the National Flag,
- (7) Inter-Communal Social Intercourse.

We have also considered the appropriate solutions of these Differences. We have noted that these Differences have been responsible for inter-communal bitterness and consequent unhappiness, and we have been convinced that if happiness is to return to our people, the first step for us should be to secure inter-communal unity. We have drawn up the solutions of these Differences in the form of Voluntary Agreements and embodied them in a TREATY OF PERPETUAL PEACE AND CONCORD to be concluded between the Hindus and the Muslims.

In the course of our examination of the situation in the Country we have noticed the question of UNTOUCHABILITY as one of the causes of discontent among the people. We have seen that this problem exists not only among the Hindus, but also among the Muslims. These Lower Classes have been demanding Equality with the Upper Classes in the political as also in the social and economic spheres.

We have seen that the Inter-Communal Differences between the Hindus and the Muslims have of late entered upon a new phase. The Muslims are now not satisfied with seeking the removal of their grievances and improvement of their lot in a United India. They now seek separation and claim to have separate homelands for themselves. We have examined the question of PAKISTAN in detail: we have seen that opinion is divided even among the Muslims themselves: we have noted the case for and against Pakistan, and we have seen that there is a fair case for it. Whether Pakistan would be strong or weak, whether the advantages would outweigh the disadvantages, we have agreed, should be the concern of the Muslims themselves. If separation is found to be the only way of restoring peace and harmony in the Country, our analysis has led us to the conclusion that Pakistan should be conceded.

The Princes naturally occupy an important place in the life of India. We have seen what others think of them and their place in relation to the Country's future: we have also seen how the Princes themselves visualise their future. We have noticed their desire and their efforts to march with the times, and to bring their administrations into line with that in British India. While there are individuals and organisations in the Country that consider the Princely Order to be an anachronism, our finding has been that the Princes have their place in the life of the Country no less necessary, useful and important than that held by any other section of the body politic.

Along with the Princes we have also examined the position of their complement—the STATES SUBJECTS. We have seen how they have lagged behind the times: we have noticed their desire and efforts to come into line with their countrymen in British India; we have examined how they can do this best in their own interests.

We have considered the contributions both the Princes and their Subjects can make in evolving a Free United India: also what their place would be therein and in its administration.

In tracing the growth of the Political Differences between the Hindus and the Muslims we have observed that the latter fear a prospect of being doomed to be a perpetual minority under any form of Democracy which must mean the rule of the majority. The Muslims consequently are opposed to any democratic constitution which must produce the above result. Their fear could only be removed if they could be placed on a footing of Equality with the Hindus. We have noticed such an arrangement could be made possible if the other minorities were to surrender their right of vote, leaving the Muslims and the Hindus to run the Government on a footing of equality among themselves. We have endeavoured to evolve such an arrangement which we have embodied in our Political Formula.

Connected with the above is the question of Communal Representation in the Legislatures and in the Services. In regard to the former, we have noticed the desire of the Muslims to adhere to Communal Electorates as have existed since the days of the Morley-Minto Reforms. We have retained this arrangement in our Formula, leaving it to the Communities concerned to seek a change if and when they so choose. As regards the Services, we have adopted the principle of Equality between the Hindus and the Muslims, and the same principle has been applied between Caste and non-Caste Hindus and between the Upper and Lower Classes of the Muslims.

These suggestions, which aim at securing inter-communal amity as also political agreement, have been embodied in what we have styled "THE INDIA CHARTER." As observed earlier, they have been framed in the form of

agreements and declarations, with the aim that they might provide Formulas for discussion on the vital questions of the day—Platforms with definite issues on which the two major Communities might be able to meet together. We have seen that the Formulas rest on the basic principle of **COMPROMISE—GIVE AND TAKE—THE GOLDEN MEAN**; and as such they are calculated to secure the maximum degree of agreement between the Muslims and the Hindus.

The **CHARTER** comprises two Parts:

1. The Communal Formula.
2. The Political Formula.

The Communal Formula comprises the solutions suggested for the Inter-Communal Differences which have been detailed in the Pirpur Report. They suggest a change in outlook and the adoption of a mode of conduct—more particularly the latter—which, it is hoped, would eliminate the causes of disagreement and help in the establishment of inter-communal peace. We have laid emphasis on this Formula, as it is felt that if peace could be established between the major communities in the matter of the Pirpur Differences, it would facilitate the solution of the Political Problem.

As regards the Political Formula, the basic principle adopted is **EQUALITY**. It involves certain sacrifices on the part of the Hindu Community and the smaller Minorities: in the case of the latter, the Formula demands the renunciation of their right of vote, restricting their function to the role of Advisers: in the case of the former, it demands of the majority community the surrender of their majority rights in exchange for equality rights. The Formula constitutes a departure from the orthodox principles of Democracy. What it does constitute may be something without precedent, but it is also something that claims to meet the requirements of the Country. It is up to my Countrymen to judge whether the claim is justified.

In our attempt at evolving a Formula for the future Constitution for the Country, we have necessarily had to examine the future relations of the Country with Britain. These would depend upon what the Country's Status was going to be—whether Independence or Dominion Status. The British Government has left the choice to us. We have examined the pros and cons of either Status. We have examined the fundamental and essential considerations that must govern the question of our future constitution, and we have laid down for ourselves certain lines along which we might tackle the question of Status. We have also laid down for ourselves the lines along which our future relations with Britain might be built up.

The end of the War may find India as far from Freedom as she is today! The Free United India we envisage may not have materialised when the Peace Treaty comes on the anvil. What India will be at the Peace Conference if United India is not there? This is a question we cannot afford to ignore. Whatever the intentions of our Rulers, it is for us to make up our own mind on this vital question. Our Formula discusses the issue and suggests an arrangement calculated to safeguard the Country's interests in the above contingency.

We have examined what is termed our **COMMUNAL PROBLEM**: we have also examined our **POLITICAL PROBLEM**: we have evolved solutions for both. For the Communal Problem we have before us the solution in "**THE TREATY OF PERPETUAL PEACE AND CONCORD BETWEEN THE MUSLIMS AND THE HINDUS OF UNITED INDIA**." It is for us to adopt the **TREATY** as drafted, or with such modifications as may be determined by mutual agreement. As regards the Political Problem, we have examined the position of the

Princes and States Subjects: also of the Muslims in relation to their claim for Pakistan: and, as a result of our examination, we have evolved a solution—a FORMULA—the principles of which we have embodied in the "CONSTITUTION" and connected Chapters in Part V, and the draft "TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN UNITED INDIA AND BRITAIN" which we have drawn up. It is for us to adopt the Drafts as they stand, or as amended by mutual agreement.

It would be trite to refer to the adage "United we stand, divided we fall." We all know that we are fallen because we are divided. We also know that if we want to get on to our feet again, we must unite. And, yet, unity is the one thing that we have not been able to achieve so far! "THE INDIA CHARTER" attempts to show the way by which, in my view, UNITY could be achieved: with unity achieved, it also attempts to show the way by which FREEDOM could be won.

*

*

*

*

Crash Your Way Through

In writing this little book and presenting my Communal and Political Formulas, it has all along been my aim to ensure that my readers do not put away the book when they have read it through, as readers usually do: it has been my aim to ensure that when they finish reading the book, they do not also finish thinking over the various questions discussed in it: it has been my aim to ensure that my readers should continue to think over those questions, and carefully study the Formulas I have presented herein: and, having done so and made up their minds over the Formulas, that they should promptly take the next step forward. They will have gathered from these pages all one need know about the Vicious Circle known as the Indian Deadlock: they will have noticed the possibilities of effecting a break-through *via* the Formulas presented herein: it will now be for them to snap this Vicious Circle that has been paralysing and suffocating us all this long while: it will now be for them to *act*, and to act with up-lifted hearts, with judgment, with decision, and with the determination to crash their way through all barriers on to the goal of Freedom—a Free United India.

The Way Out

It has been our weakness that usually we do not take the initiative ourselves: we wait till some one else makes a move forward, when we usually content ourselves with following that some one's lead! That is what has happened in the case of the many learned books that have been written on our Problem, but which have failed to achieve their object because the readers, according to their habit merely read the books and then put them away on their shelves with nobody feeling a call to take any action thereon! I am determined to see that the same fate does not overtake this little effort of mine. I am determined to see that you my readers *ACT*. If you have caught the Message I have breathed into these pages, you will have seen that on every one of the several points at issue, for every Vicious Circle small or great, I have pointed the "way out"—I have indicated to you what to do, and how to do it! And, above all, I have impressed it on you that it is *your own individual, personal duty before God*, to *ACT*. If you do not act, you will have failed in your obvious duty: and *there is no greater shame and disgrace, no lower rung of cowardice and dishonour, than for one to fail to face and carry out one's obvious duty.*

The Will-o-the-Wisp

We have been talking of a Provisional National Government at the Centre with Cabinet Responsibility for the duration of the War. It has not materialised so far and it is not likely to materialise hereafter unless the demand has the general backing of all sections in India which in its turn will not be forthcoming unless there is inter-communal unity and common agreed political platforms. Unless such unity and agreement are achieved, it would be futile persisting in this chase of the will-o'-the-wisp of a Provisional National Government. It would be in the Country's interests that we realised this and gave up the chase: and set about securing inter-communal unity and evolving agreed political platforms. If we succeed, the National Government will follow as a matter of course, and it will then be immaterial to Hindus and Muslims alike whether a Jinnah or a Jawaharlal heads such a government. My advice to my countrymen would be "Stop pining for a Provisional National Government: instead, strive to secure UNITY: concentrate your mind and energy on evolving Formulas that may tend to produce UNITY." (a)

Parties to the Tangle

There are several parties involved in the present tangle: the Muslims, the Hindus, the Depressed Classes (both Hindu and Muslim), the smaller Minorities (the Sikhs, the Anglo-Indians, the Indian Christians and the Parsees), the Princes and the States Subjects, the Congress, the Muslim League, the Hindu Mahasabha, our Elders, our Youth, and the last, but not the least, our British Rulers. I have addressed them together and also the principal parties separately: I have shown them where they have erred: what they can do to mend their error and to retrieve the lost ground, how each can help in advancing the common cause and achieving the common goal. The Communal and Political Formulas given in this book are the cumulative compost of the individual solutions suggested for the several Differences, Grievances, Inequality and Injustice, Suppression and Depression, that have collectively been labeled our Communal Problem, our Political Problem, the Indian Deadlock! It is these Formulas that demand action from all the parties: all the parties have their duties assigned to them within the framework of these Formulas: all are faced with the Call of the Hour: the Call of Duty: each one must do its own duty without waiting for the others to do theirs.

If we know Ourselves!

And yet, if we know ourselves, we know our weakness that we usually wait till some one makes a beginning! Who will make a beginning from amongst the parties named above? If I may make a suggestion, it would be this, namely, that the parties named below do take action indicated against them, in the order in which they are placed:—

ACTION ORDER

I—Communal

(i) THE CASTE-HINDUS do declare

(a) that they accept the principle of unrestricted temple-entry for the Harijans:

(a) Since the above was written, Britain's Minister for Information is reported to have declared at New York on the 28th August, 1943 that it had been decided to put the Indian political issue in cold storage for the duration of the war. (Vide page vii ante).

- (b) that where the local Sanatanist opinion is not responsive, they accept the principle that Dharma Sabhas, Public Temples, shall be established and maintained at the expense of the Caste-Hindus of the locality :
- (c) that henceforth it shall be to them a part of their dharma that they do everything in their power to remove the disabilities under which the Harijans are labouring, and to assist in their moral, economic, social, educational and political uplift :
- (d) that they accept the principle of separate communal electorate for the Harijans :
- (e) that in the matter of representation on legislative and local bodies and in the services, they accept the principle of Equality between the Caste-Hindus and the Harijans.

(ii) THE HARIJANS do declare

- (a) that they accept the above declaration of the Caste-Hindus :
- (b) that they will do everything in their power to improve, by their own exertions, their customs and mode of life from the points of view of sanitation and personal hygiene, education and social intercourse, and will extend the fullest co-operation to the Caste-Hindus in their efforts to ameliorate the Harijans' lot :
- (c) that they accept the principle that when, in the fullness of time, the distinctions and differences now separating the Harijans from the Caste-Hindus to the detriment of the former will have vanished and caste-Hindus and Harijans will have become meaningless terms, they, the Harijans, shall, on their own initiative, call for the abolition of separate electorates for them, and accept the principle of Joint Electorates.

(iii) THE HINDUS, both Caste and non-Caste, do declare

- (a) that henceforth they will ensure that their relations with their Muslim neighbours will be based on cordiality, mutual regard and brotherliness, and they will scrupulously conduct themselves towards them strictly in accordance with the principles embodied in the Treaty of Perpetual Peace and Concord between the Muslims and the Hindus of United India :
- (b) that they accept the principle of separate communal electorates for the Muslims :
- (c) that they will whole-heartedly co-operate with the Muslims in the social, educational and economic uplift of the Muslims.

(iv) THE MUSLIMS do declare

- (a) that henceforth they will ensure that their relations with their Hindu neighbours will be based on cordiality, mutual regard and brotherliness, and they will scrupulously conduct themselves towards them strictly in accordance with the principles embodied in the Treaty of Perpetual Peace and Concord between the Muslims and the Hindus of United India :
- (b) that they accept the principle that when, in the fullness of time, the differences now operating between the Muslims and the Hindus to the detriment of the former will have vanished,

they, the Muslims, on their own initiative, shall call for the abolition of separate electorates for them, and accept the principle of Joint Electorates.

II — Political

- (1) The PARSEES do announce their RENUNCIATION of their right of vote in accordance with the Renunciation Formula given at page 354.
- (2) The other smaller-Minorities, e.g., the Sikhs, the Anglo-Indians, and the Indian Christians, do make similar announcements of Renunciation on their part:
- (3) The PRINCES do announce, through the Chamber of Princes. (in accordance with the Declaration at page 338), that they are agreeable to join an All India Federation on the basic principles outlined in "THE INDIA CHARTER" as embodied in this work:
- (4) The STATES SUBJECTS do announce, through the All India States Subjects Conference or other representative body, (in accordance with the Declaration at page 348), that they accept the Princes' assurances offered in their Declaration (at page 338), and are prepared to co-operate with them in the uplift of the States and also to participate in the Federal Government in accordance with the Formulas of our CHARTER:
- (5) The Majority Community, the HINDUS, do declare, through the All India Hindu Mahasabha, that in the interests of this Country's Freedom, to be achieved through inter-communal unity, they are prepared to sacrifice their majority rights, and to work with the Muslims, *on the basis of absolute EQUALITY*, both in the struggle for Freedom as also, after Freedom has been won, in the administration of the Free United India of the future:
- (6) The MUSLIMS do declare, through the All-India Muslim League, that as an appreciation of the sacrifices voluntarily offered by the Hindu Majority Community and the smaller Minority Communities, which gesture, they, the Muslims, accept as a token of the goodwill and regard of those Communities for the Muslims, they, the Muslims, readily accept the hand of fellowship so extended to them by their sister Communities, and, by way of reciprocation, they desire to hold in abeyance their claim and demand for a separate State, Pakistan, and that they are agreeable to join the Hindus and the other Minority Communities on the basis of absolute EQUALITY, both in the struggle for Freedom, and after Freedom has been won, in the administration of the Free United India of the future:
- (7) When the above Announcements and Declarations have been made, the Presidents of the All-India Muslim League and the All-India Hindu Mahasabha do issue a joint Declaration on behalf of the Muslims and Hindus of All-India adopting generally the Principle of the Political Formula of THE INDIA CHARTER as outlined in Part V of this book: and at the same time, they do address a joint Communication to the British Government, communicating the above Announcements and Declarations, including the above joint Declaration, and demanding the initiation of the requisite steps to set up the Constitution-Making Body provided in the Formula.

If the Muslims Decide on a Different Course—

If, when the others have done their part as above, the Muslims happen to decide on a different course, the rest of us should be prepared to tell them:

“Friends, we agree to your Pakistan, whatever it is: we do not ask you what sort of government you would set up in your homelands where your minorities would have to live with you: we do not enquire whether it would be a Dominion in the British Commonwealth, or whether you would go out of the Empire straightaway, and, in the latter case, whether you would have a monarchy as in Egypt, Iran and Afghanistan, or, a republic, as in Turkey: we do not enquire whether there would be parliamentary government, and, if so, what the position of the Hindu minority would be, what their representation would be, whether there would be Hindu ministers in your Cabinets: if so, what the difference would be between your position as autonomous units within United India with equal voice with the Hindus at the Centre, and an autonomous State outside United India. These and other questions could be asked, but we do not wish to hamper you with them. You may straightaway proceed to frame your proposals and let us have a complete picture: we are agreeable to part company—in peace and with goodwill.

If you are agreeable to the Communal Formula of “THE INDIA CHARTER,” as we are, that will be enough for us. Are you agreeable to the Communal Formula? Are you agreeable?”

If the Princes Stand out—

Similarly, if the Princes choose to stand out, we should be prepared to tell them:

“We have no quarrel with Your Highnesses’ judgment and decision which must remain your own concern: we have the faith that our Creator will guide Your Highnesses to fill your exalted posts worthily and to strive for the emancipation of your subjects: all the doors of our United India shall always remain open—Your Highnesses will always be welcome to walk in whenever it may please you to do so.”

If either, or both, the Muslims and the Princes, decide to stay out, that need not disconcert us in any way. Our CHARTER provides for the creation of a Free United India for the rest of us—as a matter of fact, it provides for the initial creation of a Federation for and among ourselves as the Primary Members, enabling the Muslim Provinces and the Princes to join in as Acceding Members if they choose to come in—we shall be free to go ahead with our Federation for ourselves under our CHARTER.

So, Forward Let us March, Friends!

I have suggested the above sequence of action by the various parties in the hope that the suggestions may prove helpful to my countrymen in snapping the Vicious Circle that now surrounds them, and in making a move forward, each party along its own allotted line, but all towards the common goal, the Freedom of this Country. I am conscious that this may not be the perfect solution, or anything approaching it: there may be other and better paths: so long as they lead to our common goal, I would heartily welcome them all and support their immediate adoption: all that is needed at this hour is that we should think for ourselves, and, then, we should act in the common cause—not stand still, but march forward towards our common goal. SO, FORWARD LET US MARCH, FRIENDS, LET US FORWARD MARCH, MARCH, AND MARCH, AND REST NOT, TILL OUR GOAL IS REACHED—AND WON.

CHAPTER—X

AT THE BAR OF HISTORY

THE HOLY QUR-AN

Sura LI—ZARIYAT, or THE WINDS THAT SCATTER.

In the name of God, Most Gracious,
Most Merciful.

6. And verily JUDGMENT

AND JUSTICE must

Indeed come to pass.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
وَإِنَّ الدِّينَ لَوَاقِعٌ

*(The Holy Qur-an—Text, Translation and Commentary by
Abdullah Yusuf Ali)*

As I approach the end of this little work, and run my eyes down the pages, the principal personages who have appeared therein seem to float before A Palace of my eyes. The scene seems to resemble a Palace of Justice. I seem to see a great open Book on the Seat of Judgment with the word "HISTORY" inscribed across it. I see in the dock some familiar faces. Those in the Dock I recognise the Mahatma, in his usual attire or lack of attire, with the present Congress Cabinet grouped behind him: I see Mr. Jinnah, in flowing robes with a head-gear which looks like a crown with the legend "PAKISTAN" woven thereon in emeralds: I see Mr. Savarkar, with sashes across his shoulders bearing the words "HINDUSTAN", "HINDUTVA", "HINDUHOOD", "HINDUDOM": I see a group in the rear row who, I am told, are the Indian Intelligentsia of the years 1939-43: in the dock I also recognise Mr. Churchill and Mr. Amery with two groups behind them who, I learn, are the British Community in India and the British Parliament and People of the above period.

The Charge—High Treason Against Humanity

I am told the persons in the dock had been arraigned for maintaining, aiding and abetting Slavery in India, for setting by the ears caste against caste, class against class, community against community, and for callous disregard of human suffering and sacrifice of human lives during the World War of 1939-43 amounting to High Treason against Humanity. I am told that the trial has been completed and the Recorder is about to read out the Indictments: and even as my informant is speaking to me, I seem to hear that functionary address the men in the dock in solemn tones :

As Humanity's Spokesman I Indict You

"Mr. Winston Churchill, Mr. Leopold Amery, the British Parliament and People, and the British Community in India, of the period 1939—43.

As the Spokesman of Humanity, I indict you, on the evidence recorded, that during the period 1939-43 when the British Empire was engaged in war against Nazism and Fascism, you plunged India into the conflict without her consent: that while you professed to fight for high principles as embodied in what was known as the Atlantic Charter, you declared that those principles did not apply to India: that when the Indians clamoured for Freedom, you assured them and the world that you were prepared to part with power and grant India Freedom the moment the Indians achieved internal unity: that at the same time you made it impossible for such unity being achieved by continuing to pursue the game of setting community against community: that as the Head of the British Government of the day you, Mr. Churchill, made yourself responsible for the statement that you had not become the First Minister of the King to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, for which statement and its consequences your co-accused, through their silence amounting to acquiescence, must accept equal responsibility: that by your words and action and inaction, you allowed the Indians to nurse the belief that Great Britain had no intention to part with power: that thereby you became responsible for the continuance in India of an atmosphere of discontent and unrest resulting in the continued withholding by the Indians of full co-operation in the Empire's war effort: that thereby the war was prolonged to a material extent involving avoidable human suffering and avoidable loss of human life. As Humanity's Spokesman! I hereby indict you for bankruptcy of statesmanship, perpetuation of slavery, and for callous disregard of human suffering and loss of human life, amounting to wilful man-slaughter."

In the same solemn tones the Recorder goes on to address the other persons in the dock:

"Mahatma Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, and the Members of the Indian National Congress Cabinet of the period 1939-43,

As the Spokesman of Humanity, I indict you, on the evidence recorded, that during the World War of 1939-43 you failed to give the right guidance to India: that you failed to recognise that by advising India to withhold full cooperation in the war effort you allowed the war to be prolonged, involving avoidable human suffering and avoidable loss of human life: that that suffering and that loss of life was directly traceable to you: that if the intentions of the British Government vis-a-vis the question of India's Freedom were not above suspicion, your insistence on their parting with power before intercommunal and political unity had been achieved in India was not calculated to help the Country to reach and win her goal: that you failed to realise that in a country where the major communities were not united, mass movements, such as, non-co-operation, satyagraha, civil disobedience, etc., were bound to fail of their object and to result in unnecessary human suffering: that your insistence on the democratic form of government with rule by majority led the Muslim minority to identify the Congress with the Hindu majority community: that the Congress governments in the Provinces during 1938-40, which were identified by the Muslims as the Hindu majority rule, which was indicted by the Muslims as anti-Muslim rule, pursued policies which exacerbated feelings between the two communities and led to further alienation between them resulting in the Muslims demanding separation from the Hindus through a partitioning of the Country into Muslim India and Hindu India: that this lack of unity, this antagonism, which found expression in this demand for separation, and which continued to gain strength, proved to be a powerful force operating

against the achievement of national unity, which in its turn operated as a powerful factor which, to the British Rulers, justified their withholding the grant of Freedom to India indefinitely still inter-communal unity was achieved: that you did nothing effective to break the vicious circle so formed: that your policies directly resulted in strengthening the ultra-communalistic organisations, the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha, and giving a fillip to rank communalism in the Country: that by allowing yourselves and your organisation to become instrumental in the two communities getting further asunder, you helped in the continuance of the Country's bondage. As Humanity's Spokesman, I hereby indict you for mis-handling your instruments, misusing your opportunities, allowing false notions of prestige, pique, and other weaknesses, to supervene against the Country's interests, resorting to non-co-operation and civil disobedience after they had ceased to be in the Country's interests—a doubtful claim—thereby inflicting on the Country unnecessary and useless suffering, widening the gulf between the major communities: of short-sighted withholding of co-operation in the Country's war effort during the World War of 1939-43, thereby prolonging the war involving avoidable human suffering and avoidable loss of human life: I indict you for criminally perverse mentality, criminally perverse reasoning, criminal short-sightedness, resulting in continued bondage of India: for wanton disregard for human suffering and wanton man-slaughter during the above War."

"Mr. Mahomed Ali Jinnah and Mr. Vinayak Damodar Savarkar,

As the Spokesman of Humanity, I indict you, on the evidence recorded, that in developing the League and the Sabha into ultra-communalistic bodies you dealt a mortal blow to inter-communal unity in the Country: that by failing to unite, and by blindly pursuing your separationist ideals you effectively retarded the Country's Freedom: that thereby you allowed yourselves to become handy tools in the hands of your British Rulers: that through false notions of prestige and other weaknesses you allowed several opportunities to unite to slip from your hands, thereby betraying the trust reposed in you as leaders by your trusting followers: that in your approach to political problems you displayed a lamentable lack of statesmanship: that by your short-sighted policies which affected the Country's war effort in the World War of 1939-43 you made yourselves responsible for prolonging the war thereby causing unnecessary human suffering and avoidable loss of human life. As Humanity's Spokesman, I hereby indict you for mis-handling your instruments, mis-using your opportunities, for perverse blindness to the Country's interests, for failure to unite thereby retarding the Country's Freedom, for wilful prolongation of the war involving wanton suffering and wanton loss of life, amounting to wilful man-slaughter."

"The Indian Intelligentsia of the period 1939-43,

As the Spokesman of Humanity, I indict you, on the evidence recorded, that by thoughtlessly joining communalistic bodies like the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha, you strengthened the hands of short-sighted communalistic leaders: that by refusing to think and judge for yourselves, you made yourselves equally responsible with your leaders for their ultra-communalistic policies and programmes, which frustrated all efforts at the achievement of inter-communal unity, and effectively retarded the Country's Freedom: that those of you who joined the Congress and unquestioningly followed the fatwas of its Leaders which were directly or indirectly responsible for widening the gulf between the Muslim and Hindu communities, were similarly responsible in an equal measure for effectively retarding this Country's Freedom: that if the Leaders' responsibility for this unhappy

result was great, your own responsibility in maintaining the Leaders in their position of leadership enabling them thereby to play havoc with the Country's fortunes was immeasurably greater: that you failed to appreciate your responsibilities, you failed to allow free play to your natural instinct of comradeship and to achieve unity between neighbours and between communities, and thereby directly contributed to prolonging your Country's serfdom: that every one of you, man and woman, who belonged to the Congress, the League, or the Sabha, who did not think and judge for yourself, but allowed yourself to be led by your leaders like sheep, the blind led by the blind, failed to contribute your due share towards evolving inter-communal harmony: that you failed to allow free play to your natural instinct of fellow-feeling for your comrades under arms during the World War of 1939-43 and failed to extend to them full co-operation in their fight for Civilization thereby making yourselves responsible for prolonging the war involving avoidable human suffering and avoidable loss of human life. As Humanity's Spokesman, I hereby indict you, men and women comprising the Intelligentsia of India of the period 1939-43, I indict you for failing to allow full and free expression to your natural instincts of comradeship and fellow-feeling, for allowing yourselves blindly to follow the lead of blind men, for your failure to live with your fellow humans like humans, for failure to co-operate in the Country's war effort during the war of 1939-43 by aiding and abetting your leaders in policies which involved wanton suffering and wanton man-slaughter, thereby failing grievously in your first and most obvious duty towards Humanity."

The Verdict of History—Guilty

As the several Indictments draw to a close, I see all eyes turned and all ears strained in the direction of the Seat of Judgment: and I hear the Judgment pronounced in solemn and fateful words

**"YE WHO STAND ARRAIGNED AT THIS BAR OF HISTORY,
YE HAVE HEARD THE INDICTMENT OF HISTORY AGAINST
YE, KNOW YE THAT ON ALL COUNTS HISTORY FINDS
YE—'GUILTY'".**

EPILOGUE

EPILOGUE

"In a famous passage on the American Colonies Burke points out that what binds men together is not facts and legal rights and guarantees, but ties of blood and country, of joys and sorrows commonly shared, of the invisible memories that time weaves into the fabric of a people's lives. These are chords that bind men together and ultimately sustain them.

Such invisible chords of blood and memory sustain us also. To millions of Indians all over the country, India, one and indivisible, is not just a geographical fact but an idea with subtle spiritual and emotional overtones. From the peak of Kanchanganga to the waves that lap the shores of Dhanuskoti, in every stone and river-bed, in every nook and corner where the spirit of man has impressed itself upon the spirit of nature, the Indian sees the stamp of his national heritage and hears the mysterious music of Hindustan. Hindus and Muslims alike have heard this music and caught its strain in imperishable verse and song. To the strains of that music we have to set our hearts and face the future with hope and confidence."

• • • • •

(KAM NEMOI ZAM—KUTHRA NEMO AYENI)

TO WHAT LAND SHALL I TURN?

WHITHER SHALL I GO? (a)

(Zarathushtra to Ahura Mazda—YASNA, 46, 1)

The war has enveloped Europe, spread to Africa, America and Asia, and come to our own doors. Human suffering, the toll of human lives, have reached staggering proportions. And, we are not in sight of the end yet!

Where does India stand?

So far as the war is concerned, this Country has become a vital base for supplies, an important arsenal, serving itself and other theatres of war. The India of which Mr. Amery spoke in the Commons on the 30th September 1942, the India "that is waging war", has continued to play its part in producing munitions and supplying recruits to the fighting forces.

The other India, the Political India,—where does it stand? The Congress is in jail: the Muslim League continues to non-co-operate in the war effort until Pakistan is conceded (b): the Hindu Mahasabha continues to oppose Pakistan: non-party leaders continue their efforts to bring about an understanding between the opposing forces, and continue to fail: communal differences persist—as pronounced as ever.

* "The Communal Triangle in India" by Mehta and Patwardhan, page 233.

(a) Translation by Dastur M. N. Dhalla.

(b) For the League's justification of its stand-out see the Working Committee Resolution dated Bombay 20th August 1942 (pp. 54-56 ante.).

What of the British Government?

They continue to hold the balance even keeping the contesting parties together at arm's length apart, now talking of national homelands for the Muslims, now talking of the unity of the Country as a geographical whole: offering the while to transfer Power the moment the Country unitedly puts forward someone to take over Power!

The CARAVAN moves on:

displaying banners with strange devices!

for what destination is it bound?

where is the promised land?

when will it be reached?

The CARAVAN moves—

does it move on, or round and round the Vicious Circle now familiar to Indians as "Deadlock," "Stalemate"?

who will break the Circle?

While the Caravan moves on its unending rounds, round the Circle of Deadlock and Stalemate, the *full* complement of the Country's resources remains untapped through whatever causes, thereby lengthening the war by ever so short a period, involving the avoidable loss of hundreds of thousands of human lives—lives that could have been saved, lives that could yet be saved by hastening the end of the war by harnessing the *entire* resources of this Country with the willing co-operation of its entire manhood and womanhood.

With whom rests the responsibility for the loss of these precious lives?

Mr. Churchill has asserted he has not become His Majesty's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the Empire! What is the Empire worth if it can be held together only at the cost of hundreds of thousands of human lives, including the lives of Britishers?

Our only Concern

The Indian Leaders are striving for India's Freedom, the Muslims are striving for a separate homeland. The Freedom they seek may come: even Pakistan may come: but these can come only when we have won the war. Whether the war is just or unjust, whether it is being fought to perpetuate British Imperialism or to liberate India, whether it was thrust upon India with or without her consent, are no longer the questions that count or matter. *We are in the war and we have got to win it.* This is our only concern now, and must remain our only concern till we have won the war.

What Moral Justification?

The war will be won, with our help, or without it—soon if we help wholeheartedly: every day of absence of full co-operation by the Muslims and the Hindus alike involves the prolongation of the agony and the loss of precious lives—young, promising lives snatched from their homes, from their near and dear ones, snatched in the bloom of youth, to face the bomb and the shell, to meet an untimely end, all because the whims, fads and dogmas, the prestige and pique of their Elders, of the Politicians, of the Communal and Party and non-Party

Leaders remain un-satisfied? What moral justification our Mahatmas, our Jinnahs, and our Savarkars have to stand by and cackle* away about what they conceive to be their rights while Indian blood continues to dye the battle-fields of the world? What positive and personal contribution have they made towards fighting and winning this war? Have they moved a muscle, except their tongue? Have they sent their kith and kin, their nearest and dearest, to join the Colours? Have they contributed a single pie to the war funds?

False Gods !

Yes, we have set up, and have been worshipping, False Gods! We believed they would bring us Unity and Freedom: these are as far away as ever: instead they have brought us Disunity, and the prospect of continued bondage under Foreign Rule. Through absence of full co-operation in the war effort of the Country, they have made themselves responsible for delaying the termination of the war: they have made themselves responsible for the prolongation of the agony of mankind all over the world at war: the blood of hundreds of thousands of young men, who must meet an untimely end on the battle-fields of all the continents, rests on these False Gods—our Mahatmas, our Jinnahs, our Savarkars, and on their unthinking followings. So will posterity judge them. A terrible responsibility rests on shoulders so ill-equipped to bear such a burden.

The war must and will be won, with the help of the working and the fighting India, even if without the full support of the political party organisations. If the end of the war finds these parties without a change in their attitude, our Rulers will be free to deal with them freed from the encumbrances of the war. Some things may happen: others may not happen: but, of one thing we may be sure—there will be no political advance. It will take more than non-co-operation to achieve Freedom—it will need Unity—both sides, all sides, will have to speak with one voice, to achieve Freedom for a United India, or even to achieve Pakistan.

Can the Hindus expect the British Government to help them to establish Home Rule in this Country with the Muslims as a permanent minority, in spite of Muslim opposition? Can the Muslims expect the British Government to help them to establish Pakistan in spite of the Hindu opposition?

The Muslims must realise

The Muslims must realise that they cannot get Pakistan from the British Government. If they are in earnest about Pakistan, it would be in their interest to seek and establish unity with the Hindus and secure the establishment of Self-Government in this Country with the help and co-operation of the Hindus. When this has been achieved, when joint self-government by Hindus and Muslims in a United India has been tried out and found wanting, a separation, a dissolution of the partnership, could be effected by mutual agreement without the intervention of a third party, without recourse to the arbitrament of the sword.

* I am sorry to have used this expression: I mean no disrespect to our revered Elders and Patriot-Leaders to whom I acknowledge, with the rest of my countrymen, the deepest debt of gratitude for their selfless services and sacrifices in the cause of the Country, and I would be the last person to wish to hurt their feelings: I, however, feel most strongly on the point, and have written this passage exactly as I have felt about it: I have felt I would have been less than honest with myself if I had attempted to suppress or camouflage the feelings surging within me. I ask my readers and my Elders to extend to me their indulgence and accept the sincerity of my feelings as an excuse for the warmth of this expression.

The Hindus must realise

The Hindus must realise that, as circumstances stand today, they cannot expect the Muslims to continue to remain in the position of a permanent minority. There need be no argument about it: right or wrong, Democracy or no Democracy, this position has got to be accepted. The only alternative to Pakistan would be the creation of a sense of *equality* among the Muslims by establishing an *equal partnership* between the two communities. What would the Hindus lose by joining such a partnership? Some loaves and fishes? What would be their gain? Our Arya Varata, our Punya Bhoomee, would be saved from dismemberment: more, it will have achieved Freedom, and Peace, and Strength—Freedom, and Peace, and Strength which only mutual Trust can beget.

What will the Muslims choose?

What will the Hindus choose?

Great as is the responsibility for all, for our Elders the choice is the more difficult involving as it must do the sacrificing of power and prestige, the placing of the Country before Self: will they rise equal to the call?

If they fail, we may not blame them, crippled as they are by an unhappy heritage of generations.

Dare we have hope—in our YOUTH?

The glorious task of bringing Freedom, Peace and Strength to the Country will then devolve, undivided, on the Country's Youth. The Elders are here today, they will be here no more tomorrow. The India that we know belongs wholly to her Youth who are here today, and will be here tomorrow and the day after. The setting up of their house must be entirely their concern. Whether there shall be Freedom, Contentment, Peace and Strength in the household, or whether there shall be Strife, Bickering, Discontent, Disunity, and Weakness culminating in Disruption, must remain a matter for the Youth to decide for themselves. They have an advantage which is denied to the Elders: they are not encumbered with prejudices. They have vigour, they have vision and imagination: they are filled with an intense patriotism: they have an unbounded love for their Country. With all these advantages, will Youth succeed where the Elders have failed? Will Young India realise its DUTY, will it rise to the call of the hour? Will it realise Unity in the Country? Will it win FREEDOM for the Country? What is the answer to be?

Speak, Young India! Let your actions speak your answer. The world awaits your answer. **SPEAK!**

"TO WHAT LAND SHALL I TURN ?
WHITHER SHALL I GO ?"

asked ZARATHUSHTRA of AHURA MAZDA.

So does India of the DEADLOCK ask of her sons—

So does our Youth ask of our Elders—

"WHITHER SHALL I GO ?"

To your DUTY, Young Men!

Your DUTY to your Neighbour— Win UNITY !

Your DUTY to your Country— Win FREEDOM !

Your DUTY to Humanity — Fight and win this war

for LIBERTY and CIVILISATION!

H O P E !

Dare you Hope ?

YES ! Dare to do your Duty : and Dare to Hope :

Dare both abundantly !

Your Task then will have been done :

Your Fight will have been won.

TO YOUR DUTY, THEN, YOUNG INDIA !

DARE TO DO YOUR DUTY :

DARE TO HOPE :

DARE BOTH ABUNDANTLY :

AND MAY AHURA MAZDA GUIDE AND PROTECT YOU : A M E N !

J. E. K.

APPENDIX—I

THE LUCKNOW PACT

The following is the text of the Hindu-Muslim Concordat of Lucknow, 1916 as incorporated en bloc in the Montford Reforms:—(a)

The Congress-League Scheme—

- (a) That having regard to the fact that the great communities of India are the inheritors of ancient civilisations and have shown great capacity for government and administration, and to the progress in education and public spirit made by them during a century of British Rule, and further having regard to the fact that the present system of Government does not satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people and has become unsuited to existing conditions and requirements, the Congress is of opinion that the time has come when His Majesty the King-Emperor should be pleased to issue a Proclamation announcing that it is the aim and intention of British policy to confer Self-Government on India at an early date.
- (b) That this Congress demands that a definite step should be taken towards Self-Government by granting the Reforms contained in the Scheme prepared by the All-India Congress Committee in concert with the Reform Committee appointed by the All-India Muslim League (detailed below).
- (c) That in the reconstruction of the Empire, India shall be lifted from the position of a dependency to that of an equal partner in the Empire with the Self-Governing Dominions.

REFORM

SCHEME

I—Provincial Legislative Councils

1. Provincial Legislative Councils shall consist of four-fifths elected and of one-fifth nominated members.
2. Their strength shall be not less than 125 members in the major Provinces, and from 50 to 75 in the minor Provinces.
3. The members of Councils should be elected directly by the people on as broad a franchise as possible.
4. Adequate provision should be made for the representation of important minorities by election, and the Muslims should be represented through special electorates on the Provincial Legislative Councils in the following proportions :

Punjab	... One-half	of the elected Indian Members.			
United Provinces	... 30%	" "	" "	" "	" "
Bengal	... 40%	" "	" "	" "	" "
Bihar	... 25%	" "	" "	" "	" "
Central Provinces	... 15%	" "	" "	" "	" "
Madras	... 15%	" "	" "	" "	" "
Bombay	... One-third	" "	" "	" "	" "

(a) "THE HISTORY OF THE CONGRESS," by B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Pages 43-44, and Appendix II.

Provided that no Muslim shall participate in any of the other elections to the Imperial or Provincial Legislative Councils, save and except those by electorates representing special interests.

Provided further that no bill, nor any clause thereof, nor a resolution introduced by a non-official member affecting one or the other community which question is to be determined by the members of that community in the Legislative Council concerned, shall be proceeded with, if three-fourths of the members of that community in the particular Council, Imperial or Provincial, oppose the bill or any clause thereof or the resolution.

5. The head of the Provincial Government should not be the President of the Legislative Council but the Council should have the right of electing its President.

6. The right of asking supplementary questions should not be restricted to the member putting the original question, but should be allowed to be exercised by any other member.

7. (a) Except customs, post, telegraph, mint, salt, opium, railways, army and navy, and tributes from Indian States, all other sources of revenue should be Provincial.

(b) There should be no divided heads of revenue. The Government of India should be provided with fixed contributions from the Provincial Governments, such fixed contributions being liable to revision when extraordinary and unforeseen contingencies render such revision necessary.

(c) The Provincial Council should have full authority to deal with all matters affecting the internal administration of the Province, including the power to raise loans, to impose and alter taxation and to vote on the Budget. All items of expenditure, and all proposals concerning ways and means for raising the necessary Revenue should be embodied in Bills and submitted to the Provincial Council for adoption.

(d) Resolutions on all matters within the purview of the Provincial Government should be allowed for discussion in accordance with rules made in that behalf by the Council itself.

(e) A resolution passed by the Provincial Legislative Council shall be binding on the Executive Government, unless vetoed by the Governor-in-Council, provided however that if the resolution is again passed by the Council after an interval of not less than one year, it must be given effect to.

(f) A motion for adjournment may be brought forward for the discussion of a definite matter of urgent public importance, if supported by not less than one-eighth of the members present.

8. A special meeting of the Provincial Council may be summoned on a requisition by not less than one-eighth of the members.

9. A Bill, other than a Money Bill, may be introduced in Council in accordance with the rules made in that behalf by the Council itself, and the consent of the Government should not be required therefor.

10. All Bills passed by the Provincial Legislatures shall have to receive the assent of the Governor before they become Law, but may be vetoed by the Governor-General.

11. The term of office of the members shall be five years.

II—Provincial Governments

1. The head of every Provincial Government shall be a Governor who shall not ordinarily belong to the Indian Civil Service or any of the permanent services.
2. There shall be in every Province an Executive Council which, with the Governor, shall constitute the Executive Government of the Province.
3. Members of the Indian Civil Service shall not ordinarily be appointed to the Executive Councils.
4. Not less than one-half of the members of the Executive Council shall consist of Indians to be elected by the elected members of the Provincial Legislative Council.
5. The term of office of the members shall be five years.

III—Imperial Legislative Council

1. The strength of the Imperial Legislative Council shall be 150.
2. Four-fifths of the members shall be elected.
3. The franchise for the Imperial Legislative Council should be widened as far as possible on the lines of the electorates for Muslims for the Provincial Legislative Councils and the elected members of the Provincial Legislative Councils should also form an electorate for the return of members of the Imperial Legislative Council.
4. One-third of the Indian elected members should be Muslims elected by separate Muslim electorates in the several Provinces, in the proportion, as nearly as may be, in which they are represented on the Provincial Legislative Councils by separate Muslim electorates. (*Vide* provisos to section 1, clause 4).
5. The President of the Council shall be elected by the Council itself.
6. The right of asking supplementary questions shall not be restricted to the member putting the original question but should be allowed to be exercised by any other member.
7. A special meeting of the Council may be summoned on requisition by not less than one-eighth of the members.
8. A Bill, other than a Money Bill, may be introduced in Council in accordance with rules made in that behalf by the Council itself, and the consent of the Executive Government should not be required therefor.
9. All Bills passed by the Council shall have to receive the assent of the Governor-General before they become law.
10. All financial proposals relating to sources of income and items of expenditure shall be embodied in Bills. Every such Bill and the Budget as a whole shall be submitted for the vote of the Imperial Legislative Council.
11. The term of office of members shall be five years.
12. The matters mentioned herein below shall be exclusively under the control of the Imperial Legislative Council.

- (a) Matters in regard to which uniform legislation for the whole of India is desirable.
- (b) Provincial legislation in so far as it may affect inter-Provincial fiscal relations.
- (c) Questions affecting purely Imperial Revenue, excepting tributes from Indian States.
- (d) Questions affecting purely Imperial expenditure, except that no resolution of the Imperial Legislative Council shall be binding on the Governor-General-in-Council in respect of military charges for the defence of the country.
- (e) The right of revising Indian tariffs and customs duties, of imposing, altering, or removing any tax or cess, modifying the existing system of currency and banking, and granting any aids or bounties to any or all deserving and nascent industries of the country.
- (f) Resolutions on all matters relating to the administration of the country as a whole,

13. A resolution passed by the Legislative Council should be binding on the Executive Government, unless vetoed by the Governor-General in Council; provided however that if the resolution is again passed by the Council after an interval of not less than one year, it must be given effect to.

14. A motion for adjournment may be brought forward for the discussion of a definite matter of urgent public importance if supported by not less than one-eighth of the members present.

15. When the Crown chooses to exercise its power of veto in regard to a Bill passed by the Provincial Legislative Council or by the Imperial Legislative Council, it should be exercised within twelve months from the date on which it is passed, and the Bill shall cease to have effect as from the date on which the fact of such veto is made known to the Legislative Council concerned.

16. The Imperial Legislative Council shall have no power to interfere with the Government of India's direction of the military affairs and the foreign and political relations of India, including the declaration of war, the making of peace and the entering into treaties.

IV—The Government of India

1. The Governor-General of India will be the head of the Government of India.

2. He will have an Executive Council, half of whom shall be Indians.

3. The Indian members should be elected by the elected members of the Imperial Legislative Council.

4. Members of the Indian Civil Service shall not ordinarily be appointed to the Executive Council of the Governor-General.

5. The power of making all appointments in the Imperial Civil Services shall vest in the Government of India, as constituted under this scheme, due regard being paid to existing interests, subject to any laws that may be made by the Imperial Legislative Council.

6. The Government of India shall not ordinarily interfere in the local affairs of a Province, and powers not specifically given to a Provincial Government shall be deemed to be vested in the former. The authority of the Government of India will ordinarily be limited to general supervision and superintendence over the Provincial Governments.

7. In the legislative and administrative matters the Government of India, as constituted under this scheme, shall, as far as possible, be independent of the Secretary of State.

8. A system of independent audit of the accounts of the Government of India should be instituted.

V—The Secretary of State in Council

1. The Council of the Secretary of State for India should be abolished.

2. The salary of the Secretary of State should be placed on the British Estimates.

3. The Secretary of State should, as far as possible, occupy the same position in relation to the Government of India, as the Secretary of State for the Colonies does in relation to the Governments of the Self-Governing Dominions.

4. The Secretary of State for India should be assisted by two Permanent Under-Secretaries, one of whom should always be an Indian.

VI—India and the Empire

1. In any Council or other body which may be constituted or convened for the settlement or control of Imperial affairs, India shall be adequately represented in like manner with the Dominions and with equal rights.

2. Indians should be placed on a footing of equality in respect of status and rights of citizenship with other subjects of His Majesty the King throughout the Empire.

VII—Military and other Matters

1. The military and naval services of His Majesty, both in their commissioned and non-commissioned ranks, should be thrown open to Indians and adequate provision should be made for their selection, training and instruction in India.

2. Indians should be allowed to enlist as volunteers.

3. Executive Officers in India shall have no judicial powers entrusted to them, and the judiciary in every Province shall be placed under the highest Court of that Province.

APPENDIX—II

THE COMMUNAL AWARD. THE SUPPLEMENTARY COMMUNAL AWARD. THE POONA PACT.

The Communal Award (a)

In the statement made by the Prime Minister on 1st December last (1931) on behalf of His Majesty's Government at the close of the second session of the Round Table Conference, which was immediately afterwards endorsed by both Houses of Parliament, it was made plain that if the communities in India were unable to reach a settlement acceptable to all parties on the communal questions which the Conference had failed to solve, His Majesty's Government were determined that India's constitutional advance should not on that account be frustrated, and that they would remove this obstacle by devising and applying themselves a provisional scheme.

2. On the 19th March last His Majesty's Government, having been informed that the continued failure of the communities to reach agreement was blocking the progress of the plans for the framing of a new Constitution, stated that they were engaged upon a careful re-examination of the difficult and controversial questions which arise. They are now satisfied that without a decision of at least some aspects of the problems connected with the position of minorities under the new Constitution, no further progress can be made with the framing of the Constitution.

3. His Majesty's Government have accordingly decided that they will include provisions to give effect to the scheme set out below in the proposals relating to the Indian Constitution to be laid in due course before Parliament. The scope of this scheme is purposely confined to the arrangements to be made for the representation of the British Indian communities in the Provincial Legislatures, consideration of representation in the Legislature at the Centre being deferred for the reason given in paragraph 20 below. The decision to limit the scope of the scheme implies no failure to realise that the framing of the Constitution will necessitate the decision of a number of other problems of great importance to minorities, but has been taken in the hope that once a pronouncement has been made upon the basic questions of method and proportions of representation the communities themselves may find it possible to arrive at a *modus vivendi* on other communal problems, which have not as yet received the examination they require.

4. His Majesty's Government wish it to be most clearly understood that they themselves can be no parties to any negotiations which may be initiated with a view to the revision of their decision, and will not be prepared to give consideration to any representation aimed at securing the modification of it which is not supported by all the parties affected. But they are most desirous to close no door to an agreed settlement should such happily be forthcoming. If, therefore, before a new Government of India Act has passed into law, they are satisfied that the communities who are concerned are mutually agreed upon a practicable

(a) This extract has been taken from "THOUGHTS ON PAKISTAN" by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, pages 366-72.
Parliamentary Paper Command 4147 of 1932.

alternative scheme, either in respect of any one or more of the Governors' Provinces or in respect of the whole of the British India, they will be prepared to recommend to Parliament that that alternative should be substituted for the provisions now outlined.

5. Seats in the Legislative Councils in the Governor Provinces, or in the Lower House if there is an Upper Chamber, will be allocated as shown in the annexed table.

6. Election to the seats allotted to Muhammadan, European and Sikh constituencies will be by voters voting in separate communal electorates covering between them the whole area of the Province (apart from any portions which may in special cases be excluded from the electoral area as 'backward').

Provision will be made in the Constitution itself to empower a revision of this electoral arrangement (and the other similar arrangements mentioned below) after 10 years with the assent of the communities affected, for the ascertainment of which suitable means will be devised.

7. All qualified electors, who are not voters either in a Muhammadan, Sikh, Indian Christian (see paragraph 10 below), Anglo-Indian (see paragraph 11 below) or European constituency, will be entitled to vote in general constituency.

8. Seven seats will be reserved for Mahrattas in certain selected plural member general constituencies in Bombay.

9. Members of the 'depressed-classes' qualified to vote will vote in a general constituency. In view of the fact that for a considerable period these classes would be unlikely, by this means alone, to secure any adequate representation in the Legislature, a number of special seats will be assigned to them as shown in the table. These seats will be filled by election from special constituencies in which only members of the 'depressed-classes' electorally qualified will be entitled to vote. Any person voting in such a special constituency will, as stated above, be also entitled to vote in a general constituency. It is intended that these constituencies should be formed in selected areas where the depressed-classes are most numerous, and that, except in Madras, they should not cover the whole area of the Province.

In Bengal it seems possible that in some general constituencies a majority of voters will belong to the Depressed-Class. Accordingly, pending further investigation, no number has been fixed for the members to be returned for the special Depressed-Class constituencies in that Province. It is intended to secure that the Depressed-Class should obtain not less than 10 seats in the Bengal Legislature.

The precise definition in each Province of those who (if electorally qualified) will be entitled to vote in the special Depressed-Class constituencies has not yet been finally determined. It will be based as a rule on the general principles advocated in the Franchise Committee's Report. Modification may, however, be found necessary in some Provinces in Northern India where the application of the general criteria of untouchability might result in a definition unsuitable in some respects to the special conditions of the Province.

His Majesty's Government do not consider that these special Depressed-Class constituencies will be required for more than limited time. They intend that the Constitution shall provide that they shall come to an end after 20 years if they have not previously been abolished under the general powers of electoral revision referred to in paragraph 6.

10. Election to the seats allotted to Indian Christians will be by voters voting in separate communal electorates. It seems almost certain that practical difficulties will, expect possibly in Madras, prevent the formation of Indian Christian constituencies covering the whole area of the Province, and that accordingly special Indian Christian constituencies will have to be formed only in one or two selected areas in the Province. Indian Christian voters in these areas will not vote in a general constituency. Indian Christian voters outside these areas will vote in a general constituency.

Special arrangements may be needed in Bihar and Orissa, where a considerable proportion of the Indian Christian community belong to the aboriginal tribes.

11. Election to the seats allotted to Anglo-Indians will be by voters voting in separate communal electorates. It is at present intended, subject to investigation of any practical difficulties that may arise, that the Anglo-Indian constituencies shall cover the whole area of each Province a postal ballot being employed ; but no final decision has yet been reached.

12. The method of filling the seats assigned for representatives from backward areas is still under investigation, and the number of seats so assigned should be regarded as provisional pending a final decision as to the constitutional arrangements to be made in relation to such areas.

13. His Majesty's Government attach great importance to securing that the new Legislatures should contain at least a small number of women members.. They feel that at the outset this object could not be achieved without creating a certain number of seats specially allotted to women. They also feel that it is essential that women members should not be drawn disproportionately from one community. They have been unable to find any system which would avoid this risk, and would be consistent with the rest of the scheme for representation which they have found it necessary to adopt except that of limiting the electorate for each special women's seat to voters from one community. The special women's seats have accordingly been specifically divided, as shown in the table, between the various communities. The precise electoral machinery to be employed in these special constituencies is still under consideration.

14. The seats allotted to 'Labour' will be filled from non-communal constituencies. The electoral arrangements have still to be determined, but it is likely that in most Provinces the Labour constituencies will be partly trade union and partly special constituencies as recommended by the Franchise Committee.

15. The special seats allotted to Commerce and Industry, Mining and Planting will be filled by election through Chambers of Commerce and various Associations. The details of the electoral arrangements for these seats must await further investigation.

16. The special seats allotted to Landholders will be filled by election by special Landholders' constituencies.

17. The method to be employed for election to the University seats is still under consideration.

18. His Majesty's Government have found it impossible in determining these questions of representation in the Provincial Legislatures to avoid entering into considerable detail. There remains, nevertheless, the determination of the constituencies. They intend that this task should be undertaken in India as early as possible.

It is possible that in some instances delimitation of constituencies might be materially improved by slight variations from the numbers of seats now given. His Majesty's Government reserve the right to make such slight variations, for such purpose, provided that they would not materially affect the essential balance between communities. No such variations will, however, be made in the case of Bengal and Punjab.

19. The question of the composition of Second Chambers in the Provinces has so far received comparatively little attention in the constitutional discussions and requires further consideration before a decision is reached as to which Province shall have a Second Chamber or a scheme is drawn up for their composition.

His Majesty's Government consider that the composition of the Upper House in a Province should be such as not to disturb in any essential the balance between the communities resulting from the composition of the Lower House.

20. His Majesty's Government do not propose at present to enter into the question of the size and composition of the Legislature at the Centre since this involves among other questions that of representation of the Indian States, which still needs further discussion. They will, of course, when considering the composition, pay full regard to the claims of all communities for adequate representation therein.

21. His Majesty's Government have already accepted the principle that Sind should be constituted a separate Province, if satisfactory means of financing it can be found. As the financial problems involved still have to be reviewed in connection with other problems of federal finance, His Majesty's Government have thought it preferable to include, at this stage, figures for a Legislature for the existing Province of Bombay, in addition to the scheme for separate Legislatures for Bombay Presidency proper and Sind.

22. The figures given for Bihar and Orissa relate to the existing Province. The question of constituting a separate Province of Orissa is still under investigation.

23. The inclusion in the table of figures relating to a Legislature for the Central Provinces including Berar does not imply that any decision has yet been reached regarding the future constitutional position of Berar.

London,

4th August 1932.

Supplementary Communal Award (a)

"Then there was the question of the representation of communities in the Centre, particularly of the Muslim community. There, I think, I can say, definitely—I think I have said it indirectly very often before—that the Government consider that the Moslem community should have a representation 33 1/3 per cent. in the Federal Centre. As far as Indian India is concerned that must be a matter for arrangement between the communities affected and the princes, but, so far as the British Government has any part in the question we will, at any time, give our good offices to making it as easy as possible for the arrangement between those parties with regard to the future allocation of seats."

(a) The Communal Award of His Majesty's Government did not give any decision regarding the Muslim claim for 33 1/3 per cent. representation in the Central Government. The decision of His Majesty's Government on this claim was announced by the Secretary of State for India on 24th December, 1932 in the course of his statement to the Third Round Table Conference.

The Poona Pact. (a) — Signed on 25th September, 1932.

(1) *There shall be seats reserved for the Depressed Classes out of the general electorate seats in the Provincial Legislatures as follows:—*

Madras 30: Bombay with Sind 15: Punjab 8: Bihar and Orissa 18:
Central Provinces 20: Assam 7: Bengal 30: United Provinces 20:
Total 148.

These figures are based on the total strength of the Provincial Councils, announced in the Prime Minister's decision.

(2) Election to these seats shall be by joint electorates subject, however, to the following procedure:

All the members of the Depressed Classes registered in the general electoral roll in a constituency will form an electoral college, which will elect a panel of four candidates belonging to the Depressed Classes for each of such reserved seats, by the method of the single vote; the four persons getting the highest number of votes in such primary election, shall be candidates for election by the general electorate.

(3) Representation of the Depressed Classes in the Central Legislature shall likewise be on the principle of joint electorates and reserved seats by the method of primary election in the manner provided for in Clause two above for their representation in the Provincial Legislatures.

(4) In the Central Legislatures, eighteen per cent. of the seats allotted to the general electorate for British India in the said Legislature shall be reserved for the Depressed Classes.

(5) The system of primary election to a panel of candidates for election to the Central and Provincial Legislatures, as hereinbefore mentioned, shall come to an end after the first ten years, unless terminated sooner by mutual agreement under the provision of Clause six below.

(6) The system of representation of Depressed Classes by reserved seats in the Provincial and Central Legislatures as provided for in Clauses 1 and 4 shall continue until determined by mutual agreement between the communities concerned in the settlement.

(7) Franchise for the Central and Provincial Legislatures for the Depressed Classes shall be as indicated in the Lothian Committee Report.

(8) There shall be no disabilities attaching to any one on the ground of his being a member of the Depressed Classes in regard to any elections to local bodies or appointment to the Public Services. Every endeavour shall be made to secure fair representation of the Depressed Classes in these respects, subject to such educational qualifications as may be laid down for appointment to the Public Services.

(9) In every province out of the educational grant, an adequate sum shall be earmarked for providing educational facilities to the members of the Depressed Classes.

(a) This extract has been taken from "THOUGHTS ON PAKISTAN," by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, pages 374-5.

COMMUNAL AWARD of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, 1933**Grounds of Opposition—Hindu Mahasabha. (a)**

The Session of the Mahasabha held in 1932 at Delhi was of particular importance to the Hindu community in that it condemned the Communal Award on the following grounds:—

- (1) That it maintains and extends the scope of separate communal electorates against all canons of democratic, responsible and representative Government which the British Government are pledged to establish in Hindustan:
- (2) That it belies the Prime Minister's own declaration in the House of Commons on January 19, 1931, emphatically condemning communal electorates and weightages in representation as they leave no room for national political organisations or parties:
- (3) That it flouts the unanimous opinion of the vast Hindu community, of the Sikhs, of important sections of Muslims, Christians, and Depressed Classes, and also of the women of India in favour of joint electorates:
- (4) That it practically forces separate communal electorates on unwilling Hindu minorities in the Punjab and Bengal:
- (5) That it even extends separate electorates to women against their agreed demands to the contrary:
- (6) That in the name of protection of minorities it has only granted protection to Muslims whether they form majority or minority, while not only no protection has been granted to Hindu minorities, but they have been even deprived of a part of their representation which they are entitled to on the basis of their proportion in population:
- (7) That it provides for differential treatment of minorities favouring Muslim and European minorities in that
 - (i) it adds an artificial and arbitrary weightage to the representation of Muslim minorities;
 - (ii) it reduces the representation of the Hindu minorities of Bengal and Punjab below what they are entitled to on the basis of their proportion to the population;
 - (iii) it denies to the Sikhs the weightage in representation which it grants to Muslim minorities under similar conditions;
 - (iv) it grants to European and Anglo-Indian minorities a weightage of representation which is grossly out of proportion to their strength in population; and
 - (v) it reduces the representation of the Hindu Minorities of Bengal and the Punjab to what is flagrantly out of proportion to their contributions to taxation and to the culture, charitable benefactions and general progress of their respective provinces.

- “(8) That it destroys the communal equipoise of the Lucknow Pact which was an agreed solution of the communal problem and which was endorsed even by the Simon Commission in the absence of any other agreed solution:
- (9) That the communal decision is not an award of an arbitrator to which the parties concerned are committed, but it is the decision of the British Government:
- (10) That the contention that an agreed Indian solution of the communal problem is not forthcoming is unwarrantable in as much as the problem was, at its origin, the creation of the Government itself:
- (11) That its solution has been obstructed by conditions created by Government such as the publication of the Government of India's despatch on Simon Commission practically conceding in advance almost all the demands of the Muslims and by the exclusion of nationalist Muslims from the Round Table Conference.

The Mahasabha's resolution embodying the above Grounds concluded as under:—

“Therefore, as circumstances favourable to an agreed solution do not exist the Hindus Mahasabha, in accordance with its previous resolutions, recommends that the communal problem of Hindustan be settled, on an all-India basis, on the lines of the International Communal Award as embodied in Minorities' Guarantee Treaties to which his Majesty's Government and the Government of India are already committed as parties and signatories, and which now form part of the public law of Europe and of the world, guaranteeing to minorities full protection, linguistic, cultural, educational and religious, but not through separate communal electorates.

The Hindu Mahasabha invites all other communities to stand for this International Communal Award formulated by the highest Arbitral Body of the world as their agreed solution of the communal problem.”

The following resolution moved by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya was adopted by the Anti-Communal Award Conference held at New Delhi on the 23rd February 1935 presided over by Mr. C. Y. Chintamani :—

“Resolved that this second session of the All-India Anti-Communal Award Conference condemns without reservation or qualification the so-called Communal Award as being grossly unjust (to the Hindus and the Sikhs particularly) as making for increased communal discord, as being anti-national and undemocratic, and as rendering it very difficult for the legislatures to function on non-communal lines for the amelioration of the condition of the people as a whole as well as because it will have the effect of strengthening British domination over India.” (a)

The following resolutions were adopted at the Communal Award Conference held at New Delhi on 24th March 1935 presided over by the Nawab of Dacca:—

- (1) This Conference is of opinion that the Award falls short of legitimate demands of Indian Muslims but in view of the fact that there is no better agreed scheme before the country, the Muslim Community is determined to accept and work it as far as it goes and so long as there is no other agreed settlement of communal problem.

- (2) This Conference strongly protests against the unjust, hostile and unreasonable attitude of a section of British politicians, fortunately small, towards the legitimate political safeguards demanded by Indian Muslims. It further opines that such expression of anti-Muslim feelings will exasperate the Muslims, imperil the trust of Muslims in British statesmanship, and hamper the growth of genuine Indian unity and political settlement.
- (3) (a) The Conference condemns in strongest terms the activities of the sponsors of Anti-Award movement, a movement which is calculated to create bitterness among the communities and would result in a setback of the political progress of the country:
- (b) this Conference particularly deplores the holding of Anti-Award Conference in Delhi and the decision to send a deputation to London headed by Pundit Malaviya to agitate against the Award and hereby requests Messrs. Jinnah, K. L. Gauba and other responsible Muslim leaders of India who happen to be in England this summer to do all in their power to counteract and expose the mischievous propaganda." (a)

The following resolutions were adopted by the All Bengal Depressed Classes Conference held at Jhendah (Jessore) on the 19/20th May, 1935 under the Presidentship of Sj. Rajani Kanta Das of Dacca:—

- (1)
- (2) This Conference is definitely of opinion that the British Premier's Communal Award is anti-national, undemocratic and fraught with dangerous consequences, being primarily intended to consolidate British Imperialism in India upon the vivisection of our body politic, this Conference therefore rejects the Communal Award in all its aspects, and urges the launching of a country-wide campaign against the Award with a view to its replacement by a system of representation on the basis of joint electorate with adult franchise, which is the *sine qua non* for the growth of a free and democratic India.
- (3) In view of the unnecessary cost involved in the double system of election inherent in the Poona Pact, this Conference proposes that a Committee consisting of the following persons, with power to co-opt, may re-consider the provisions of the Poona Pact with a view to arrive at a satisfactory agreed settlement between the parties concerned. The Committee is hereby desired to announce their decision within two months and take the necessary steps for its acceptance by the authorities." (b)

The following resolution was adopted by the All-India Hindu Mahasabha at Cawnpore on the 21st April, 1935 under the Presidentship of the Revd. Ottama Bhikku:—

"The Hindu Mahasabha reiterates its complete condemnation of the communal 'award' decision of His Majesty's Government, as it is anti-national and glaringly unjust, particularly to Hindus and Sikhs, and declares its determination to carry on a campaign against the said communal decision until it is replaced by more equitable solution." (c)

- (a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1935, Vol. I, page 328.
- (b) " " " " " " " " 345.
- (c) " " " " " " " " 333.

Resolution No. IX adopted by the All-India Hindu Mahasabha at their sessions in 1938:—

“The Hindu Mahasabha reiterates its condemnation of the Communal Award as it is grossly unjust to Hindus, anti-national and undemocratic in character and as it makes the growth of responsible government in India absolutely impossible.

The Mahasabha refusing as it does to look upon the Communal Award as a dead issue, calls upon the Hindus to carry on persistent agitation against it, both here and abroad, until it is replaced by a system of really National Representation.” (a)

Extract from the presidential address of Sir Bijoy Prasad Singh Roy, ex-Minister, Government of Bengal, at the annual sessions of the National Liberal Federation of India at Madras on the 26th December, 1941:—

“The Communal Award strikes at the basis of citizenship. Rights of citizenship are derived from the fact that citizens are members of society. The scheme of the Communal Award is strung on a different note: the common life is subordinated to the communal life: the social well-being is sacrificed to group interests.....The method of representation is to be judged by the test if the free will of the citizens is reflected in the legislature....” (b)

TABLE OF SEATS PROVINCIAL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLIES (under the Government of India Act, 1935)..

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
		General Seats.													Seats for Women.			
Province.	Total Seats.	Total of General Seats.	General Seats reserved for Scheduled Castes.	Seats for representatives of backward areas and tribes.	Sikh Seats.	Muhammadan Seats.	Anglo-Indian Seats.	European Seats.	Indian Christian Seats.	Seats for representatives of commerce, industry, mining and planting.	Landholders Seats.	University Seats.	Seats for representatives of labour.	General.	Sikh.	Muhammadan.	Anglo-Indian.	Indian Christian.
Bombay	215	146	30	1	—	28	2	3	8	6	6	1	6	5	1	1	1	1
—	—	114	15	1	—	29	2	3	3	7	5	1	7	2	—	—	—	—
—	—	78	30	—	—	64	1	2	2	19	5	1	8	2	—	—	—	—
—	—	140	20	—	—	84	1	1	2	3	4	1	3	1	—	—	—	—
—	—	42	8	—	—	39	1	1	1	1	3	1	4	2	—	—	—	—
—	—	86	15	—	—	14	1	2	1	2	4	1	2	3	—	—	—	—
—	—	84	20	—	—	31	—	—	—	11	2	—	3	3	—	—	—	—
—	—	47	7	—	—	34	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	1	—	—	—	—
—	—	9	—	—	—	36	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	44	6	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	18	—	—	—	33	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

In Bombay seven of the general seats are reserved for Marathas.
In the Punjab one of the Landholders' seats is filled by a Tumandar.
In Assam and Orissa the seats reserved for women are non-communal seats.

TABLE OF SEATS

THE FEDERAL ASSEMBLY (as provided in the Government of India Act, 1935).

1	Province.	2 Total Seats.	General Seats:—		5 Sikh Seats.	6 Muham- madan Seats	7 Anglo- Indian Seats.	8 Euro- pean Seats.	9 Indian Chris- tian Seats.	10 Seats for repre- sentatives of com- merce and industry.	11 Land- holders Seats.	12 Seats for repre- sentatives of labour.	13 Women's Seats.
			3 Total General Seats.	4 General seats reserved for Sche- duled castes.									
Madras	--	37	19	4	--	8	1	1	2	2	1	1	2
Bombay	--	30	13	2	--	6	1	1	1	3	1	2	2
Bengal	--	37	10	3	--	17	1	1	1	3	1	2	1
United Provinces	--	37	19	3	--	12	1	1	1	--	1	1	1
Punjab	--	30	6	1	6	14	--	1	1	--	1	1	1
Bihar	--	30	16	2	--	9	--	1	1	--	1	1	1
Central Provinces and Berar	--	15	9	2	--	3	--	--	1	--	--	--	--
Assam	--	10	4	1	--	3	1	1	1	--	--	--	--
North-West Frontier Province	--	5	1	--	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Orissa	--	5	4	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Sind	--	5	1	--	--	3	--	1	--	--	--	--	--
British Baluchistan	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Delhi	--	1	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ajmer-Merwara	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Coorg	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Non-Provincial Seats	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	1	--
Totals	--	250	105	19	6	82	4	8	8	11	7	10	9

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF
PERCENTAGE OF MUSLIM SEATS TO THE TOTAL ELECTED MEMBERS.**

Legislatures.	1909 (Morley- Minto Reforms)	1915 (Lucknow Pact)	1919 (Montford Reforms)	1935 (Ramsay Macdonald Communal Award).	
Bihar	(a) 19	(a) 25	25	26	(a) This also included Orissa which then with Bihar formed a single province.
Bombay	(b) 19	(b) 33 1/3	35	17	(b) " " Sind which then with Bombay formed a single province.
Central Provinces ..	19	15	13	13	
Madras	19	15	14	13	
United Provinces ..	19	30	30	28	
Orissa	7	In 1936 Mr. Jinnah demanded a 50% share in the governance of the Country.
Assam	18	..	35.5	32	In 1940 the above demand was replaced by that for setting up Independent States in areas in which Muslims are in a majority.
Bengal	18	40	40.5	47	
Punjab	19	50	48.5	48	
North West Frontier Province	72	The figures in this Table have been taken from "THE COMMUNAL TRIANGLE IN INDIA" by Ashoka Mehta and Achyut Patwardhan, (pp. 34, 106, 108).
Sind	55	

APPENDIX—III

COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION ON LEGISLATURES AND IN SERVICES.

COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION IN SERVICES.

Government of India Resolution—Establishments—No. F. 14/17-B/33, dated the 4th July, 1934, published in the Gazette of India, part I, dated the 7th July, 1934. (a)

Section I—General.

In accordance with the undertakings given in the Legislative Assembly the Government of India have carefully reviewed the results of the policy followed since 1925 of reserving a certain percentage of direct appointments to Government service for the redress of communal inequalities. It has been represented that though this policy was adopted mainly with the object of securing increased representation for Muslims in the public services, it has failed to secure for them their due share of appointments and it has been contended that this position cannot be remedied unless a fixed percentage of vacancies is reserved for Muslims. In particular, attention has been drawn to the small number of Muslims in the Railway services, even on those railways which run through areas in which Muslims form a high percentage of the total population.

The review of the position has shown that these complaints are justified, and the Government of India are satisfied by the enquiries they have made that the instructions regarding recruitment must be revised with a view to improving the position of Muslims in the services.

2. In considering this general question the Government of India have also to take into account the claims of Anglo-Indians and Domiciled Europeans and of the depressed classes. Anglo-Indians have always held a large percentage of appointments in certain branches of the public service and it has been recognised that in view of the degree to which the community has been dependent on this employment steps must be taken to prevent in the new conditions anything in the nature of a rapid displacement of Anglo-Indians from their existing positions, which might occasion a violent dislocation of the economic structure of the community. The instructions which follow in regard to the employment of Anglo-Indians and Domiciled Europeans in certain departments are designed to give effect to this policy.

3. In regard to the depressed classes it is common ground that all reasonable steps should be taken to secure for them a fair degree of representation in the public services. The intention of caste Hindus in this respect was formally stated in the Poona Agreement of 1932 and His Majesty's Government in accepting that agreement took due note of this point. In the present state of general education in these classes the Government of India consider that no useful purpose will be served by reserving for them a definite percentage of vacancies out of the number available for Hindus as a whole, but they hope to ensure that duly qualified candidates from the depressed classes are not deprived of fair opportunities of appointment merely because they cannot succeed in open competition.

(a) This Resolution has been taken from "THOUGHTS ON PAKISTAN" by Dr. Ambedkar, pages 376-80.

4. The Government of India have also considered carefully the position of minority communities other than those mentioned above and are satisfied that the new rules will continue to provide for them, as at present, a reasonable degree of representation in the services.

Section II—Scope of Rules.

5. The Government of India propose to prescribe annual returns in order to enable them to watch the observance of the rules laid down below.

6. The general rules which the Government of India have with the approval of the Secretary of State adopted with the purpose of securing these objects are explained below. They relate only to direct recruitment and not to recruitment by promotion which will continue to be made as at present solely on merit. They apply to the Indian Civil Service, the Central Services, Class I and Class II, and the subordinate services under the administrative control of the Government of India with the exception of a few services and posts for which high technical or special qualifications are required, but do not apply to recruitment for these Services in the province of Burma. In regard to the Railways, they apply to all posts other than those of inferior servants or labourers on the four State-managed Railways, and the administrations of the Company-managed railways will be asked to adopt similar rules for the services on these railways.

Section III—Rules for Services recruited on an All-India basis

7. (1) *For the Indian Civil Service and the Central and Subordinate services to which recruitment is made on an All-India basis, the following rules will be observed:—*

- (i) 25 per cent. of all vacancies to be filled by direct recruitment of Indians, will be reserved for Muslims and 8 1/3 per cent. for other minority communities.
- (ii) When recruitment is made by open competition, if Muslims or the other minority communities obtain less than these percentages, these percentages will be secured to them by means of nomination; if, however, Muslims obtain more than their reserved percentage in open competition, no reduction will be made in the percentage reserved for other minorities, while if the other minorities obtain more than their reserved percentage in open competition, no reduction will be made in the percentage reserved for Muslims.
- (iii) If members of the other minority communities obtain less than their reserved percentage in open competition and if duly qualified candidates are not available for nomination, the residue of the 8 1/3 per cent. will be available for Muslims.
- (iv) The percentage of 8 1/3 reserved for the other minorities will not be distributed among them in any fixed proportion.
- (v) In all cases a minimum standard of qualification will be imposed and the reservations are subject to this condition.
- (vi) In order to secure fair representation for the depressed classes duly qualified members of these classes may be nominated to a public service, even though recruitment to that service is being made by competition. Members of these classes, if appointed by nomination, will not count against the percentages reserved in accordance with Clause (i) above.

(2) For the reasons given in paragraph 2 of this Resolution, the Government of India have paid special attention to the question of Anglo-Indians and Domiciled Europeans in the gazetted posts on the Railways for which recruitment is made on an All-India basis. In order to maintain approximately their present representation in these posts the Anglo-Indian and Domiciled community will require to obtain about 9 per cent. of the total vacancies available to members of Indian communities. The Government of India have satisfied themselves that at present the community is obtaining by promotions to these gazetted posts and by direct recruitment to them more than 9 per cent. of these vacancies. In these circumstances, it has been decided that no special reservation is at present required. If and when the community is shown to be receiving less than 9 per cent. of the vacancies, it will be considered what adjustments in regard to direct recruitment may be required to safeguard their legitimate interests.

Section IV—*Rules for Services recruited Locally.*

(3) In the case of all services to which recruitment is made by local areas and not on an All-India basis, *e.g.*, subordinate posts in the Railways, Posts and Telegraphs Department, Customs Service, Income-Tax Department, etc., the general rules prescribed above will apply subject to the following modifications:

(1) The total reservation for India as a whole of 25 per cent. for Muslims and of $8\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. for other minorities will be obtained by fixing a percentage for each Railway or local area or circle having regard to the population ratio of Muslims and other minority communities in the area and the rules for recruitment adopted by the local Government of the area concerned;

(2) In the case of the Railways and Posts and Telegraphs Department and Customs Service in which the Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European community is at present principally employed special provisions described in the next paragraph are required to give effect to the policy stated in paragraph 2 above.

9. (1) (a). The Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European community at present hold 8.8 per cent. of the subordinate posts on the railways. To safeguard their position 8 per cent. of all vacancies to be filled by direct recruitment will be reserved for members of this community. This total percentage will be obtained by fixing a separate percentage (i) for each railway having regard to the number of members of this community at present employed, (ii) for each branch or department of the Railway service, so as to ensure that Anglo-Indians continue to be employed in those branches in which they are at present principally employed, *e.g.*, the Mechanical Engineering, Civil Engineering and Traffic Departments. No posts in the higher grades of the subordinate posts will be reserved, and promotion to these grades will be made, as at present, solely on merit:

(b) the reservation of 25 per cent. for Muslims and 8 per cent. for Anglo-Indians makes it necessary to increase the reservation of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. hitherto adopted for all minority communities, in order to safeguard the interests of minorities other than Muslims and Anglo-Indians. It has been decided, therefore, to reserve for them 6 per cent. of vacancies filled by direct recruitment, which is approximately the percentage of posts held by members of these communities at present. This total reservation will be obtained in the manner prescribed in paragraph 8 (1) of this Resolution and will not be further sub-divided among the minority communities.

(2) In the Posts and Telegraphs Department the same principles will be followed as in the case of the Railways for safeguarding the interests of the

Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European community which at present holds about 2.2 per cent. of all subordinate posts. It has been ascertained that if a reservation is made for this community of 5 per cent. of the vacancies in the branches, departments or categories which members of this community may reasonably be expected to enter, it will result in securing for them a percentage equal to slightly less than the percentage of subordinate posts which they at present hold. In the departments or branches in which a special reservation is made for Anglo-Indians the reservation of vacancies for other minorities will be fixed so as to be equal approximately to the percentage of subordinate posts at present held by them. The total reservation for Anglo-Indians and other minority communities, other than Muslims, will in any case be not less than $8\frac{1}{3}$ per cent.

(3) Anglo-Indians are at present largely employed in subordinate posts in the Appraising Department and in the Superior Preventive Service at the major ports. For the former department special technical qualifications are required, and in accordance with the general principles indicated in paragraph 6 of this Resolution it will be excluded from the operation of these rules. In the Preventive Service special qualifications are required, and the present system of recruitment whereby posts are reserved for Anglo-Indians will be maintained. ORDER—Ordered that this Resolution be communicated to all Local Governments and Administrations and the several Departments of the Government of India, for information (and guidance) and that it be also published in the Gazette of India.

M. G. HALLETT,

Secretary to the Government of India.

The following report of "further Concessions to the Scheduled Classes" appeared in the Daily Gazette, Karachi, dated the 30th November 1943:—

"NEW DELHI, Nov. 29.—Concessions recently given by the Government of India to members of the scheduled classes include a seat in the Council of State, an additional seat in the Central Assembly, reservations in the Indian Civil Service, reservation of $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in recruitment to the central services, reservations for technical training at railway shops and the Dhanbad School of Mines and a provision of Rs. 300,000 a year for these scholarships for technical training in India and abroad.

These are in response to a memorandum which, it is learned, soon after his appointment as Labour Member of the Government of India, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar submitted to the Viceroy on the "grievances of scheduled castes" in this country. This memorandum, *inter alia*, demanded adequate representation of scheduled castes in the Central Legislature, central executive, in the public services, and on the Federal Public Service Commission. It also emphasised the want of assistance for advanced education and technical training for the scheduled castes.

After analysing the representation given to the various communities in Central Legislature Dr. Ambedkar pointed out that the Legislature was "quite an unbalanced body" and suffered from over-representation of some communities and under-representation of other communities. He asserted that the power of nomination was wrongly used and did not rectify the inequalities of representation. The scheduled castes had only one representative in a house of 141 (Central Assembly), and it had not been possible for him to ventilate the grievances of the scheduled castes.

As a result of this representation, the scheduled castes have been given one more seat in the Central Assembly and one seat, for the first time, in the Council of State.

As for the central executive, Dr. Ambedkar asserted that the position of the scheduled castes in Indian politics needed a great deal of stabilisation and the only effective remedy was to give them representation in the Cabinet, which is demanded by their numbers and their needs.

As for the I. C. S., Dr. Ambedkar pointed out that there was one scheduled caste I. C. S. out of the present cadre of 1,056. The July, 1934, resolution did not declare the scheduled castes as a minority nor did it allot to them any fixed proportion of the annual vacancies. He demanded that his community should be declared a minority for the purpose of services and a quota of $13\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. should be allotted for them. The Government have now declared the scheduled castes a minority and have fixed a quota of $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for them. The age limit has been raised for them and also a reduction in examination fees allowed."

JOINT/SEPARATE ELECTORATES

Separate Electorates

No. 5 of Mr. Jinnah's 14 POINTS laid down that

"representation of communal groups shall continue to be by means" of separate electorates as at present, provided that it shall be open to any community, at any time, to abandon its separate electorate in favour of joint electorates." (a)

Electorates and Services

Extract from the presidential address of Dr. Promotho Nath Banerjee at the sessions of the Indian Political Science Conference held at Lahore on 2nd January, 1940:—

"The question of representation in the legislatures and the local bodies is a source of acute difference in India. The system which prevails at present is not the representation of the people but the representation of races, creeds, classes, sexes, and special interests. In some cases differences have been deliberately fostered. The consequence of this system of separate communal representation has been an enormous growth of dissensions. Separation has led to the demands for further separation, and antagonism, has taken the place of harmony. This system of representation, therefore, must be regarded as an evil, and in the interests of the unity and peace of the country it should be removed at the earliest possible moment. Recruitment to the public services is a subject which has given rise to a great deal of controversy. Unfortunately, both at the Centre and in some of the provinces, certain percentages have for some time past been fixed for recruitment from the different communities, and in the case of some of these communities only the minimum qualifications have been demanded of the candidates. This has resulted in considerable deterioration of administrative efficiency, and it is apprehended that a continuance of this policy will be a source of greater harm in future. The true way of getting out of this difficulty, however, lies in affording adequate educational facilities to the less advanced communities and not in giving them unfair advantages." (b)

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1938, Vol. I, page 59.

(b) " " " " " " 1940, " I, " 422.

Communal Electorates

Extract from the Proceedings of the Annual Sessions of the National Liberal Federation of India held at Madras on 27th December, 1941:—

"Mr. M. D. Altekar moved the last resolution on the order paper for the day. The resolution affirmed that the aim of India's political evolution should be democracy not based on considerations of race, or creed; that the Federation was opposed to the permanent existence of communal electorates and the present communal award and that, as it would not be practicable to effect the reforms immediately, steps should be taken to eliminate separate communal electorates by the creation of joint electorates with reserved seats for a definite period.

A good deal of the mischief that had assumed dangerous forms today, the speaker said, could be traced to the introduction of separate electorates. This system bred a certain amount of religious and credal fanaticism as a result of which nationalism suffered. In a country where nationalism had to be evolved out of various elements there was grave danger to that objective in having a system which gave prominence to race and religion, and not to nationalism." (a)

The Search For Security

"The root of the matter lies in the search for security which is fundamental to politics. The innate quest of the individual and the family for security in the supply of food, clothing and shelter, is one of the prime reasons for the emergence of the state. The search of states for security is one of the governing factors in international affairs. The search of groups and associations for security economic, cultural and religious supplies a large part of the tissue of domestic politics. It finds its sanction in power or a share in power. Politics, therefore, revolve largely round security and power; much depends on the manner in which security is guaranteed and power exercised. Institutions that assist a pursuit of security in common and an exercise of power in unison foster the General Will, a disinterested regard for the common welfare. All that favours an isolationist search for security, and therefore for power, makes for inter-group conflict. (b)

A religion or social cleavage must be recognised in politics, but it is unsafe to make it the foundation of a superstructure and to give a separatist turn to the search for security and power. Corporate life cannot be built on the basis of differences. The art of creative politics consists in opening new avenues of co-operation and integrating the differences into a new synthesis. (c)

The Muslims' search for security led them to demand special safeguards and as large a share in the devolution of power as was commensurate with their position, importance and aspirations. These tendencies were accentuated and transformed into new antagonisms by the institution of separate electorates in 1909." (d)

Students of politics have asserted that

(a) proportional representation with weightage to minorities, or

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1941, Vol. II, page 255.

(b) THE HINDU-MUSLIM QUESTIONS, by Beni Prasad, page 43.

(c) " " " " " " 44.

(d) " " " " " " 42.

(b) general electorates with reservation of seats for the Muslims might have met the case as it stood about 1906-09 and satisfied the Muslims. Separate electorates introduced in 1909 promptly reinforced all the disintegrating tendencies, all the separatist elements of revivalism and in fact became their political counterpart. Joint electorates would have favoured modernist forces and progress on nationalist lines: as it was, revivalism and separate electorates supplemented each other and favoured a cultural and political milieu on the separatist basis.

"There began the habit of regarding the Hindus and the Musalmans as separate political entities. The system freed the majority representatives from the obligation of canvassing the support of the minorities and more than neutralised the advantages of the weightage. It enfeebled the capacity of every group to throw the centre of gravity outside itself and protect its interests in the national context. It loosened the control which considerations of general welfare should exercise on the course of affairs. It hampered the growth of public opinion as distinct from sectional opinion. Co-operation, eliminated from the polling booth, was rendered more and more difficult in the legislature and in public life as a whole. The poison worked steadily." (a)

"...a number of Hindu communalists as distinct from nationalists were always returned by Hindu constituencies. The Muslim constituencies quite as naturally rang with cries of danger to religion, language and culture and need of protection in all possible ways. The Hindu reaction conjured up a danger to Hindu rights, stigmatised the Congress as pro-Muslim and often looked upon compromise as surrender. Brooding converts a craving for protection into offensive conflict. As the separate electorate stabilised itself, the sense of disintegration grew more and more intense and the ideal of social justice had to fight a losing battle against the longing for privilege and domination." (b)

I have quoted the above extracts at length to show how the introduction of separate electorates in 1906-09 have operated to keep the major communities apart. However, I am prepared to accept them and to allow them to continue. The Plan of Representation that I have proposed in this work not only permits of their continuance, but makes them a necessary vehicle of expression of the communities' undiluted and unfettered voice.

"It is necessary to stabilise the proportion of the communities in the legislatures both federal and provincial. There are four conditions of a general character which a communal settlement must satisfy in order to be durable and conducive to social harmony:—

- (1) It must not reduce a majority to minority or to equality with the minorities as a whole anywhere;
- (2) It must not reduce the representation of a minority below its numerical proportion;
- (3) It must give a reasonable weightage to minorities in an inverse proportion to their numbers;
- (4) The weightage must not be so large as to jar on the sense of justice and fairness and require the exertion of force rather than an appeal to the twin principles of justice and political expediency for its maintenance."

On the above considerations Prof. Beni Prasad holds that it would be desirable to accept the Communal Award and the Poona Pact of 1932 for the most part, a revision being called for in the case of Bengal where the Muslim majority has been reduced to a minority and the Hindu minority to a yet smaller minority in the legislature, the balance being held by the European and other groups who have been awarded a disproportionately large number of seats. (a)

I grant that the four conditions recited by Prof. Beni Prasad are vital for the correct functioning of democratic bodies under normal circumstances. The circumstances in India, however, are far from normal. They are not only not normal, but the drift of the last decade has forced them into a state which is scarcely natural. The whole atmosphere has been vitiated and surcharged by a most unhealthy suspicion. Abnormal conditions call for abnormal adjustments if the body politic is to be given a chance of being restored to normalcy. Democratic principles may enjoin that a majority shall not be reduced to a minority. This may be readily granted, for to attempt the opposite would be to seek to produce an unnatural state which cannot be sustained by any means except unremitting force. We know that in India today the second largest single community, the Muslims, would go out and have a state of their own with all its handicaps rather than continue within a state where they may be in a perpetual position of a minority. They, a minority, demand a position of equality with the majority. Democratic principles could not sanction it. Prof. Beni Prasad criticises such demand in the following words:—

“But in regard to British India it seems desirable to accept the British Government’s decision announced in 1932 to allot one-third of the seats to Musalmans, *inter alia* on the ground that a revision would provoke keen controversy and embitter public life. On the other hand it is necessary to sound a note of warning against the demand for equal representation of Hindus and Musalmans in the centre or in any of the provinces. Political settlements which flagrantly violate the sense of fairness can be sustained only by force—force which creates more problems than it can solve. It postulates perpetual British control and, therefore, nullification of self-government. It entails the possibility of the British Government getting tired of the job of upholding an inequitable settlement and letting it fall to pieces. Secondly, the grant of a 50 per cent. of the seats to Musalmans will lead the other minorities, the Christians, the Sikhs, the Parsis and, it may be, the depressed classes, to demand a disproportionately large number of seats so that a satisfactory settlement would always remain beyond reach.” (b)

And yet, Expediency demands that it shall be sanctioned—call the resultant situation by whatever name we like. But a state of equality must be brought about, if peace and harmony are to return to the land and if the major communities are to live together as good brothers, or good sisters, or good partners. The Plan of this work would secure this.

(a) Beni Prasad, page 149.

(b) „ „ „ 150.

APPENDIX—IV

CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

Extract from the Report of the General Secretary of the Indian National Congress for the period March, 1939 to February, 1940:— (a)

"The resolution passed by the Working Committee emphasised that the freedom that the Congress contemplated for the country included the full recognition and protection of the rights of all minorities to which the Congress had always pledged itself. They also emphasised that the easiest method of arriving at a solution of the communal problem was provided by demand for a Constituent Assembly. It would represent the various parties and interests in the country according to their exact numerical strength and set at rest the otherwise interminable controversies with regard to the representative character of this or that organisation. Muslims would have representation on it to the full extent of their numerical strength in the country, through separate electorate, if they so desired. Seats may be reserved for other accepted minorities. It will be the special responsibility of the Constituent Assembly to frame safeguards to the satisfaction of the minorities. Matters whereon agreement was not possible would be referred to a previously agreed Tribunal. The settling of details was an easy matter if once the proposition that all communities desired independence, with a Constitution framed by the Constituent Assembly, was accepted. This was the most democratic method conceivable in the circumstances for arriving at an agreed solution."

The National Liberal Federation's idea of a Constitution-Framing Body as against the Congress idea of Constituent Assembly—

(Resolution passed at the sessions of the National Liberal Federation held at Allahabad on 27-29th December, 1939)—(b)

"The Liberal Federation is strongly of opinion that the future constitution of India should be framed by Indians themselves, but considers that the idea of the proposed Constituent Assembly is impracticable and is likely to retard our progress.

The Federation therefore suggests that a conference be convened in India by His Majesty's Government for framing the constitution and that it should be composed of:—

- (1) The representatives of elected members of Provincial and Central Legislatures in British India elected on the basis of proportional representation:
- (2) The representatives of elected members of legislatures of Indian States:
- (3) The Rulers of major States or their ministers invited by the Viceroy and the representatives of other Princes elected by the Chamber of Princes:
- (4) Representatives elected by landholders' associations, associations representing trade and commerce, and associations representing agricultural and industrial labour:

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1939, Vol. II, page 270.

(b) " " " " " " " pages 296-7.

- (5) a certain number of members of the Conference to be nominated by the Viceroy to represent such interests and views as may otherwise go unrepresented :”

Extract from the Presidential Address of Dr. R. P. Paranjpye at the sessions of the National Liberal Federation at Allahabad held on the 27-29th December, 1939:— (a)

“The insistence on a Constituent Assembly seems to be equally impolitic. The scheme can be riddled with objections and its discussion is likely to create further difficulties. It seems magnificent to call such an assembly elected on adult suffrage: but does one seriously think that the illiterate villager, who would form the vast portion of the electorate, is capable of pronouncing an opinion upon complicated matters like the machinery of the Government of a vast country like India? Is it too uncharitable to say that Mr. Gandhi expects to carry the uneducated voter off his feet by means of a whirlwind campaign in which high sounding words like truth, *ahimsa*, *charkha*, *dharma*, untouchability, reinforced, if need be, by the threat of a fast, would be used as slogans to give him a mandate to do what he likes? Is it not likely that such a campaign will lead to inter-communal riots unless there is previous understanding with the leaders of other parties? Already there have been several modifications of the original idea of the adult suffrage: minorities are to be given the right of separate election for the purpose of electing this assembly: the question of weightage has been left beautifully vague: the question of representation of Indian States has been untouched: the way in which minorities of opinion that do not bow the knee at the Shegaon shrine are to be represented has been left unconsidered: and a vast number of other questions have been held over possibly to give a chance to the Mahatma's ‘inner voice’ to express itself. Several of these questions are to be first settled, according to Mr. Gandhi, by a consultation among the leaders of the various parties, or even by the award of the Government which it is intended to replace. If such an agreement is possible on these vital preliminary points in regard to the formation of the constituent assembly by a friendly discussion among the leaders or even through the benevolent intervention of Government itself, what objection can there be to such discussion on the whole question of our constitution itself? If the thing is possible in one connection, it should be possible in another. I am reminded of the ambitious chemist who desired to discover a reagent which could dissolve every solid substance, but was non-plussed when asked by a plain man in what receptacle he was going to store this reagent. Is it too much to say that Mr. Gandhi is like this chemist who does not see such a practical objection to his ambitious scheme? The history of all constituent assemblies, whenever they appear to have succeeded, shows that the ground was first of all fully prepared by informal discussion among all leaders and by securing an almost complete preliminary unanimity and then, if at all it was considered necessary, a formal cachet of approval was given to it by means of a constituent assembly if it could be convoked. Many such ambitious projects have on the other hand led to heated disputes that ended in nothing as at the time of the French Revolution.

I am inclined to think that a more appropriate course for our leaders would be to follow the path, which though it actually failed in the end, seemed to be so promising, and get together a small informal manageable

conference like that which drafted the Nehru report. Even Pundit Jawaharlal may condescend to take a leaf out of his father's book."

Extracts from the Presidential Address of Moulana Abul Kalam Azad at the Ramgarh Congress, March 1940 :—

"We could attach no greater importance to it (the Communal Problem) than to make it the first condition for the attainment of our national goal. The Congress has always held this belief : no one can challenge this fact. It has always held to two basic principles in this connection, and every step was taken deliberately with these in view :—

- (1) whatever constitution is adopted for India, there must be the fullest guarantees in it for the rights and interests of minorities
- (2) the minorities should judge for themselves what safeguards are necessary for the protection of their rights and interests. The majority should not decide this. Therefore the decision in this respect must depend upon the consent of the minorities and not on a majority vote.

.....

The manner in which the Congress has dealt with this problem today in connection with the Constituent Assembly throws a flood of light on these two principles and clarifies them. The recognised minorities have a right, if they so please, to choose their representatives by their vote. Their representatives will not have to rely upon the votes of any other community except their own. So far as the question of the rights and the interests of the minorities is concerned, the decision will not dwell upon the majority of the votes in the Constituent Assembly. It will be subject to the consent of the minority. If unanimity is not achieved on any question, then an impartial tribunal to which the minorities have also consented, will decide the matter. This last proviso is merely in the nature of a provision for a possible contingency, and is most unlikely to be required. If a more practical proposal is made, there can be no objection to it." (a)

The following resolution was adopted by the Azad Muslim Conference at New Delhi on the 30th April 1940 :— (b)

"It is the considered opinion of this Conference that the future constitution of India should be framed by a Constituent Assembly elected on the basis of adult suffrage. In that constitution, the safeguards for protecting the rights and interests of the Musalmans should be determined by the Muslim members of the Constituent Assembly. The representatives of other communities or any foreign Power shall have no right to interfere in that decision."

By a further resolution the Azad Conference recorded that

"since the safeguards of the communal rights of different communities will be determined in the Constituent Assembly, this Conference considers it necessary to declare that Muslim members of the Constituent Assembly will be elected by Muslims themselves." (c)

(a) THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER, 1940, Vol. I, page 296.

(b) " " " " " " " " 330.

(c) " " " " " " " " 331.

Mr. Jinnah on a Constituent Assembly:—

“Let us consider briefly the implications of this nebulous and impracticable Constituent Assembly. To commence with, the question arises, why is this demand made at this particular time? The answer is obvious. The war is to the Working Committee (of the Congress) a heaven-sent means of increasing its rule from over eight provinces to over the whole of India, State and Province. If the British Government are stampeded and fall into the trap under stress of the critical situation created by the war, India will face a crisis the result of which no man could prophesy, and I feel certain that Muslim India will never submit to such a position and will be forced to resist it with every means in their power.

And of what type of constitutionalist will this Constituent Assembly consist? There are in India roughly 400 million souls who, through no fault of their own, are hopelessly illiterate and consequently, priest and caste ridden. They have no real conception of how they are being governed even today, and it is proposed that to the elected representatives of such, should India's future constitution be entrusted. Is it too much to say that since the vast majority of the elected representatives will be illiterate Hindus, the Constituent Assembly will be under the influence of Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress leaders, and the constitution that will emerge will be as the Working Committee directs?

Thus, through the Constituent Assembly will the Working Committee attain its ends. British control and commerce will disappear; the Indian States will be abolished! Minority opposition will be stifled and a great Hindu nation will emerge, governed by its beloved leader, Mahatma Gandhi, and the Congress Working Committee.” (a)

The composition of a Constitution-Making Body as suggested in the CRIPPS PROPOSAL will be found at page 45 *ante*.

(a) Extract from an article by Mr. Jinnah in the "TIME AND TIDE" dated the 19th January 1940, as reproduced at pages 27-28 of "INDIA'S PROBLEM OF HER FUTURE CONSTITUTION."

APPENDIX—V

NATIONAL MINORITIES AND INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEES

The following Summary (compiled from 'NATIONAL STATES AND NATIONAL MINORITIES' by C. A. Macartney, and Great Britain, Treaty Series, Vol. 112, pages 232 ff: History of the Peace Conference, Vol. V, pages 437-42) has been extracted from "WHITHER MINORITIES?" by M. N. DALAL, pages 41-47:—

"The rights guaranteed to the minorities, which are described as 'racial, religious, or linguistic,' are contained in the treaties made with new States set up in 1919-20, or in the declarations made by some of these States before the League of Nations. A standard pattern of these rights is contained in the treaty with Poland, a short summary of which is given below:—

- (1) Poland undertook to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty of all inhabitants of Poland, without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race, or religion.
- (2) All inhabitants (not only citizens) of Poland are entitled to the free exercise, whether public or private, of any creed, religion, or belief, whose practices were not inconsistent with public order or public-morals.
- (3) Inhabitants of regions made part of Poland, under the arrangements which set up the State of Poland, were admitted to be Polish nationals without any formality. But those inhabitants over 18 years of age, who desired to retain their former nationality,—German, Austrian, Hungarian, or Russian,—would be entitled to retain their nationality. Such option exercised by a husband would include his wife, and by parents would include their children under 18 years of age. Those who exercised such right of option were, however, required within a year to transfer their residence to the State for which they had opted, retain their immoveable property in Poland, and allowed to carry all their moveable property with them. No export duties were to be charged on such transfer of moveable property.
- (4) All persons of German, Austrian, Hungarian, or Russian nationality, who were born in these territories, of parents habitually residing there, were to be admitted as Polish nationals.

In their case, the right was allowed to make a declaration before competent Polish authorities in the country they were residing, stating that they desired to abandon their Polish nationality. On such a declaration being made, they would cease to be regarded as Polish nationals. The same provision, as regards the declaration by a husband including his wife, and by parents including their children, would apply in this case also.

- (5) Poland bound itself to put no obstacle in the way of the declaration of these rights of option provided for in the treaties with Germany, Austria, Hungary, or Russia. Those born in Polish territory must be regarded as Polish nationals, if they are not born national of any other State.

- (6) In Poland, all Polish nationals are equal before the law. All enjoy the same civil and political rights, irrespective of race, language or religion. Differences in religion do not prejudice any Polish national in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil or political rights, such as admission to public employment, functions and honours, or the exercise of any professions or industries.
- (7) No restriction must be imposed on the full use by any Polish national of any language, in private intercourse, in commerce, in religion, in the press, or in publications of any kind, or at public meetings. This does not debar the Polish government from having an official language of the State. But if such an official language is established, adequate facilities must be given to Polish nationals of other than Polish speech, to use their national language in speech or writing before the courts.
- (8) Polish citizens belonging to racial, religious, or linguistic minorities are assured the same treatment and security, in law and in fact, as all other Polish nationals; and particularly, they have equal rights, to establish and control at their own expense charitable, religious, and social institutions, schools and other educational establishments, along with the right to use their own language, and to exercise their religion freely therein.
- (9) In the public educational system of Poland, both in town and country, wherever Polish nationals of other than Polish speech were to be found in considerable proportion, adequate facilities must be provided to ensure that, in the primary schools, instruction is provided to the children of such Polish nationals through the medium of their own language. Polish language may, however, be made compulsory by government as a subject for instruction in these schools.
- (10) Wherever in town and country, there is a considerable proportion of such Polish nationals, belonging to racial, religious or linguistic minorities, these minorities are assured a share in the enjoyment and application of the money which may be provided out of public funds by the State, municipal, or other budgets, for educational, religious, or charitable purposes. Provisions of this article apply to Polish citizens of German speech, only in that part of Poland which was German in August 1914.
- (11) Educational committees appointed locally by Jews in Poland will, subject to the general control of the State, provide for the distribution of the proportional share of public funds allocated to Jewish schools. The right of using their own language, also, applies as regards these schools. Jews are not compelled to perform any act, which constitutes a violation of the Sabbath, nor are they placed under any disability, because of their refusal to attend courts of law, or to perform any legal business on their Sabbath. But this would not exempt them from such obligation as shall be imposed upon all other Polish citizens for the necessary purposes military service, national defence, or the preservation of public order.
- (12) On the other hand Poland declared her intention to refrain from ordering or permitting elections, whether general or local, to be held on a Saturday, nor would registration for electoral or other purposes be compelled to be performed on a Saturday.

- (13) Poland agreed that the stipulations in the preceding articles, in so far as they affect persons of racial, religious or linguistic minorities, constitute 'obligation of international concern.' These are placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations. They should not be modified without the assent of the majority of the League Council. The United States, British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, agreed, that such consent would not be withheld, if the majority of the Council of the League of Nations had already assented to such modification.
- (14) Poland also agreed that any member of the Council of the League of Nations had the right to bring to the attention of the Council any infraction, or danger of infraction, of any of these obligations. The Council may thereupon take such action, and give such direction, as it may think proper and effective in the circumstances.
- (15) Any difference of opinion as to questions of law or fact, arising out of these Articles, between the Polish Government and any member of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, or any other Power, which was a member of the League Council, must be held to be of an international character, under Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations; and, as such, it must be referred, if the other party so demands, to the Permanent Court of International Justice and the decision of the Court must be final."
-

APPENDIX — VI — THE CENSUS 1941

(From the Census of India, 1941—Vol. J—INDIA—TABLE XIII).

	Provinces	States and Agencies	Total	Percentage (Approx)
Hindus	19,08,10,953	6,41,19,583	25,49,30,506	65.50
Scheduled Castes	3,99,20,807	88,92,373	4,88,13,180	12.90
Others	15,08,90,146	5,52,27,180	20,61,17,326	52.60
Muslims	7,93,98,503	1,49,90,925	9,43,89,428	24.50
Christians				
Indian Christians	32,45,706	27,94,959	60,40,665	1.50
Anglo-Indians	1,13,936	26,486	1,40,422	0.05
Others	1,22,788	12,674	1,35,462	0.05
Sikhs	41,65,097	15,26,350	56,91,447	1.30
Jains	5,78,372	8,70,914	14,49,286	0.25
Parsees	1,01,968	12,922	1,14,890	0.05
Buddhists	1,67,413	64,590	2,32,003	0.10
Jews	19,327	3,153	22,480	0.05
Tribes	1,67,13,256	87,28,233	2,54,41,489	6.50
Others	3,71,403	38,474	4,09,877	0.15
	29,58,08,722	9,31,89,233	38,89,97,955	100.00

The following Note appears in the Census Reports:—

“The figures for tribes include all members of tribal communities, no matter what their individual religion may be. The tribal figures therefore include a considerable number of persons who profess Hinduism, tribal religion, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam. Conversely, the columns allotted to Hindus, Buddhists, Indian-Christians and Muslims give figures which exclude the tribal adherents of those religions.”

INDEX

A

Aba Musa Mash'ari, 140
 Abdul Latif, Dr., 91, 92
 Abdullah Yusuf Ali, see Quran, the Holy.
 Acceding Units, 262, 276
 Accession, of Provinces and Princes,
 under the Cripps Plan, 44, 262
 " — under the Plan of this Book, 264, 276
 " — Instrument of — 276
 Achhuts, 114
 Action Order, 401
 Adult Franchise, 265
 Advisers, 275, 300, 353, 399
 Afzal Haq Ahrar, Ch.: 89, 178
 Agreed Constitution, 260
 Agreed Plan, 258
 Ahrars, See Majlis-i-Ahrar.
 Ahura Mazda, 411, 415
 Ajlafs, 104
 Akhand Hindustan, 352, 376
 Akbar, 140
 Al-Baizawi, 136, 139, 141
 All-India Depressed Classes Conference
 *See Depressed Classes.
 All-India Hindu Mahasabha, See Mahasabha.
 All-India Momins Conference, See Momins.
 All-India Muslim League, See League.
 All-India Scheduled Classes Federation, See
 Depressed Classes.
 All-India Unity Conference, 1924; 124
 Altruism in statecraft, 316
 Amery, Leopold S.,
 On British Rule in India, 58
 On Constitutional Deadlock in India, 42
 Congress Position, 42
 League Position, 42
 Position of Princes, 43
 Position of Scheduled Castes, 43
 On Indian Constitutional Deadlock, 25
 On India First, 28
 On India's Political Goal, 17
 On the Major Issue, 32
 On Muslim Fears and Hesitations of the
 Princes, 311
 On Need for New Leadership, 312
 On Need for Wider Unity, 31
 Anacreon Moore, 313
 Anthem, National, 170
 Appeal to Europeans in India, 310
 Aqiqah, 137, 139
 Arabic Pandits, 166
 Armageddon, 261
 Arthashastra, The Cow in— 129
 Arzals, 104
 Ashrafs, 120
 Asses, VII, 371
 Ass-tva, Ass-ness, Ass-hood, Ass-dom, 371
 Assistance, Military, to United India under
 the Treaty with Britain, 297
 Atlantic Charter, see Charter.
 Autocracy, 338, 344, 345, 347, 349, 368, 369
 Avarnas, 104

Azad, Moulana Abul Kalam—
 On Basic Principles anent the Communal
 Problem, 189
 On the Basic Question for Indian
 Muslims, 191
 On Common Nationality, 193
 Azad Punjab, 216
 Azan,
 Text and Translation, 147
 Voluntary Agreement, 151, 287

B

Bad Characters, Registration of, 293
 Bande Mataram,—Muslim View, 171
 Bapoo, 335, 336, 338
 Bar of History, 465
 Barrier, 345, 346, 347, 359
 Bengalee Nationalism, 196
 Beni Prasad, iii, 85, 86, 87, 158, 159, 160
 Bird of Passage, 309
 Books, Text—, 170, 291
 Brailsford, H. N.,
 On the Future, 65
 What is Independence, 249
 Breaches of the Peace, 294
 British Empire—See Empire.
 British Government, 412
 Attitude re: Constitutional
 changes in States, 323
 India's place in the War, 35
 Relations with Britain—
 Future, 259, 265, 270, 282, 296
 Settled Policy, 58
 British Imperialism, 256
 British Rule, Its Benefits, 313
 British Rulers, To Our, 309
 Brotherhood, Universal, 388, 391
 Bureaucracy, 344
 Bus that was missed, 56, 72

C

Call of Duty, 395, 401
 Call—The, For the Muslims, 362
 Caravan of India, 69, 80, 412
 Caste System, Its Merits, 106
 Its Demerits, 105
 Its Future 107
 —Dubois, 109
 —Henry Beveridge, 109
 Rushbrook
 Williams, 107
 —Ward, 110
 —The Lord Shri
 Krishna to
 Arjuna, 110
 See also under
 "Untouchability"
 Census Table, See Appendix VI
 Chaman-i-Pakistan, 174, 358
 Charges and Counter-charges, 95, 96
 Charter, Atlantic, 18, 261
 Charter, India, 261
 Charters of Liberty and Rights, 261

- Churchill, Winston Spencer.
 'At the Bar of History, 405
 Before the Joint Parliamentary
 Committee on Indian Reforms, 17
 On Britain's heart as known to
 Gladstone, 314, 315
 On Dominion Status as a Goal
 for India, 312
 On exclusion of India from
 the Atlantic Charter, 19
 On the Settled Policy of the
 British Government, 58
 We mean to hold our
 own, 66, 313, 314, 315
- Circles, 381, 404
- Citizen of United India, 393
- Civilisation, March of, 372
- Civilisations, Muslim and Hindu, 97
 Two distinct, 88
- Code of Conduct, 360, 370
- Cold Storage, VII
- Collective Responsibility, 281
- Colour-Bar, 250
- Commerce, under Treaty with Britain, 296
- Communal Award-Macdonald's, see
 Appendix II
- Communal Differences, 126
- Communal Electorates, 265, 269, 277, 300,
 Appendix III
- Communal Proportion in Services, 301,
 Appendix III
- Communal Question, 81,
- Communal Representation, 301,
 Appendix III
- Communal Unity, Suggestions, 124
- Communalism an old Problem, 83
- Communities in the Past, 83
- Communities in the Present, 85
- Compromise, V, 359, 360, 365
- Comradeship, Message of, VI
- Conflict of Economic Interests, 87
- Conflict of Political Interests, 87
- Congress, Indian National,
 Attitude towards the Govt. of
 India Act, 1935, 5
 Attitude towards the States, 37
 Basic Principles anent the
 Communal Problem, 189
 Economic and Social Programme, 8
 Fundamental Principles, Objects,
 Goal, 4
 Fundamental Rights, 7
 Gandhian Congress must die, 377
 On Political Goal for India, 19
 Position under the Indian
 Constitutional Deadlock
 according to Mr. Amery, 42
 Rejection of the Cripps
 Proposals, 46
 Reorientation of Policy, 378
 Rights of Minorities, 6
 Constituent Assembly, see Appendix IV
- Constitutions, 268
- Constitution, Federal, 262
 Accession of Acceding Members, 276
 Cabinets, 280
 Conduct of Business, 279
 Conventions, 280
- Constitution, Federal, 262 (Cont.)
 Dissolution of Federation, 282
 Electorates, 277
 Federal Court, 281
 Federal House—Council of
 Five, 272, 279, 305
 Federal Railway Authority, 281
 First Elections, 278
 Franchise, 265, 277, 285
 Legislatures, 276
 Pakistan, 282
 Powers and Functions, 281
 Prime Ministers, 279
 Relations with Britain on termination
 of First Treaty, 282
 Representation on Legislatures, 277
 Representation in Services, 278, 301
 Reserve Bank, 281
 Residuary Powers, 265, 281
 Revision of Constitution, 267, 281
 Secession of Acceding Members, 282
 Speakers, 279
- Constitution, Fundamental Principles
 of a—260, 262, 284
- Constitution—Making Body, 262
 —Composition, 275
 Function, 275
 Constitution of, 274
- Constitution, Revision of, 267, 281
- Conventions, 280
- Cow Flesh—Use of as food, 129
 —Aba Musa Mashari, 140
 —Akbar, according to
 Dabistan, 140
- Cow Question, 128
 Hindu View-Point, 128
 Muslim " " 131
 Some Suggestions, 140
 Voluntary Agreement, 146, 286
- Cow Sacrifice—
 Aqiqah, 137, 139
 Character of—
 Commemorative, 139
 Eucharistic, 139
 Expiatory, 139
 Self-dedicatory, 139
 In the Traditions, 136
 On Idu'l Azha, 136, 144
 The Teaching of the Holy Quran, (Surah
 XXII, 37), 136
 The Teaching of the Hidayah, 137
- Cripps Mission—Proposals, 44
 Accession of Provinces and States, 262,
 263
 Princes on the eve of—43
 Rejection by the Congress, 46
 " " " Depressed Classes, 50
 " " " Mahasabha 48
 " " " Sikhs 50
 " " " League, 51
- Cripp Mission and After—378
 Dr. Ambedkar on Inflated Values, 66
 League reiterates its stand, 66
 Muslim Mind, 69
- Cultural Autonomy, 92
- Cultural Differences, 205
- Cultures, Muslim & Hindu, 97, 391
- Current History, 25

D

- Dapple, 240, 371
 Dar-ul-Aman, 383
 Dar-ul-Harb, 201, 202, 241, 383
 Dar-ul-Islam, 201, 202, 241, 383
 Dates, Some, 43
 Deadlock, vi, 25, 42, 80, 80d, 262, 313, 345, 346, 347, 348, 359, 368, 397, 400, 401, 415
 Declarations 1917, 1929—17, 314
 Delhi, 309, 319
 Democracy
 An unsolved Problem—protection of the rights of Minorities, 343
 As envisaged by the States Subjects, 342
 Concept of—that would suit Indian conditions, 368
 Ethos of, 345
 In the days of Plato, 340
 March of—in India, 363
 Modern Democratic Theory, 342
 Plutocracy in, 345
 Tyranny of Majorities, 343
 Under the Industrial System, 344
 Unsuited for India, Jinnah 184
 Western—and Hindus, 368
 Western—and Indian Muslims, 183, 368
 Democracy of our Charter, 349, 368
 Depressed Classes—104
 All-India Depressed Classes Conference on Political Goal for India, 20
 All-India Scheduled Classes Federation, 76, 364
 Constitution must be 'tripartite', 364
 Dr. Ambedkar on Inflated Values, 66
 Position under the Indian Constitutional Deadlock, according to Mr. Amery, 43
 Rejection of the Cripps Proposals, 50
 Also see under "Caste System" and "Untouchability".
 Destiny, vi, viii, 362, 396
 Destiny, Men of—356, 362
 Detached Eye, 372
 Diet in the Vedic Period, 129
 Differences between Hindus & Muslims, 85, 288, 357, 358
 Differences, Cultural, 205
 Differences, Linguistic, 156, 206, 288
 Dissolution of Federation, 282
 Divergence of Social Systems, 87
 Divide et Impera, 373
 Dominion Status 259, 305, 312
 " " Difference between the Dominions and India, 249
 Don Quixote, 239, 386
 Doors, Open, see Open,
 Dravidastan, 241
 Dream of a Muslim India, 33
 Duets discordant, 371
 Duty—The Princes, 339
 The Muslims, 360

E

- Economic Interests, Conflict of 87, 207
 Education Controversy between Muslims & Hindus, See under "Language Question"
 Education and Eternal Values, Sir S. Radhakrishnan, 386
 Elders, iii, v, 371, 372, 414

- Elections—First, 278
 Electorates, 277
 Electorates, Communal, 269, 283, 300, 439
 Empire's Brightest Jewel, 313, 314
 Empire, Liquidation of—66, 313, 314, 315, 406, 412
 Entry of non-nationals into United India, under the Treaty with Britain, 297
 Epilogue, 411
 Equality, 258, 264, 268, 300, 348, 349, 365, 369, 377, 383, 385
 Equality in Voting Strength, Supporting reasons, 354
 Erskine, 85
 Essentials, 300
 Expectations, Great, 43, 363
 External Relations, 270
 Eye, Detached, 372

F

- Facts about India, 50, Extract from 18
 Fairplay, 268
 False Gods, 413
 Federation;
 Acceding Members, 273, 276, 282
 Accession of Provinces & States, 262, 276
 Accession of Provinces & States, under the Cripps Plan, 44, 262
 Accession of Provinces & States, under the Cripps Plan—Congress Criticism, 46, 263
 Accession of Provinces & States, under the Plan of this Book, 264
 Basic Principle, 264
 Cabinet of Ministers, 272, 279, 280
 Collective Responsibility, 281
 Conventions, 280
 Council of Five, 272, 279, 305
 Dissolution of, 282
 Federal Constitution, see under Constitution.
 Federal Court, 281
 Federal House of Representatives, 272, 277, 278, 281
 Federal Railway Authority, 281
 Federal States, 272
 Head of the States, 272
 Pakistan, 282
 Permanent Members, 273
 Primary Members, 262, 273
 Relations with Britain, 265, 282, 296
 Reserve Bank, 281
 Residual Powers, 265, 281
 Secession of Acceding Members, 282
 Solidarity—Our Plan secures, 264
 Voluntary Renunciation, 265
 Federations, Muslim & Non-Muslim, 195
 Fellowship, 384
 Financial Commitments of United India under Treaty with Britain, 296
 Fiscal Relations under Treaty with Britain, 296
 Flag, National, 173
 Slaves & Flags, 17
 of Freedom, 175
 Following, iv, 393
 Forbearance, 263
 Forge:

Formulas, ii, iii, v, vi,
 Communal, 258, 286
 Political, 258, 262
 " Basic Principle, 264
 Franchise, 265, 277, 285
 Freedom, i, v, vi, 258, 259, 310, 314, 326, 391,
 396, 400, 414
 Freeships, 167
 Free United India, 258
 Frustrate, Determined to, 102
 Frustration, vi, 54, 69, 80, 379
 Fundamental Principles of a Constitution,
 260
 Fundamental Rights of Citizens of United
 India, 285

G

Gains, 314, 315
 Gandhi, see Mahatma Gandhi,
 Geographical "one-ness" of India,
 Lord Linlithgow on the—67
 Getting together, 380
 Give and Take, 357
 Gladstone, on the heart of Britain, 314
 Glory of Government, the
 Inspiration and Motivating
 Force behind Pakistan, 218, 240
 Goal—Political—for India—
 As envisaged by Britain, 16
 " Indians, 19
 Of the Oppressed and Exploited Masses,
 20
 Of States Subjects, 342, 345, 346, 347,
 348, 349
 Of Youth, 391
 Gods, False, 413
 Going to Government, 240, 371
 Golden Age, 317
 Golden Mean, v, 145, 247, 357, 359
 Goodwill, 268
 Government, the Happiest, 317
 Grants-in-aid, 165c
 Great Expectations, 43, 363
 Guru, 342, 345, 346, 347, 349

H

Hallelujahs, 315
 Harijans, (People of God)
 See Untouchables & Depressed Classes.
 Hidayah, 137
 High Treason against Humanity, 405
 Hindi, the Language,
 See Language Question,
 Hindu, All-India—Mahasabha,
 see Mahasabha,
 Hindu-dom, 371
 Hindu-hood, 371
 Hindu-tva, 14, 371
 Hindu Majority Rule, 90
 Hindu Nation, 363
 Hindu Party, 13
 Hindustani, the Language, 158
 History, Bar of, 405
 History, Current, 25
 Homelands, 371

I

Independence, 249, 259, 272, 313
 Independent United India, 259

India Charter, the, 261
 India First, iv, 28, 364
 India's place in the War, 35
 India's place in the War—How a Turkish
 Journalist looks at it, 35
 Indian Culture, 386
 Indian National Congress, see Congress
 Indian Temperament, 86
 Indictments, 405-408
 Inequality, 268, 385
 Injustice, 268, 385
 Instrument of Accession, 276
 Intelligentsia, 389, 407
 Inter-Communal Social Intercourse, 175
 Inter-Communal Relations, 269
 Inter-Communal Social Intercourse,—A
 Voluntary Agreement, 292
 International Agreements and Obligations,
 under the Treaty with Britain, 297
 International Law, 272
 Irvin, Lord, Declaration, 1929, 17
 Irvin, Lord, in America, 1932, 17, 809
 Irvin, Lord, Before the Joint Parliamentary
 Committee on Indian Reforms, 17

J

Jagannathjee's Rath, 318
 a Fifteenth Wheel ! 318
 Jinnah, M. A.,
 14 Points, 1928, 92
 11 Points, 1938, 93
 At the Bar of History, 407
 Invites the Mahatma to write to him, 73
 Minds made up, 80c
 On the Nataikval of Muslim India, 194
 On War Effort, 71
 Pliable Pawn, 376
 The Letter Episode, 77
 Thus Spake Jinnah ! 193
 Western Democracy unsuited for
 India, 184
 What is a Jinnah ! 391
 What moral justification, 413
 With whom am I to negotiate ? 80d
 Judgment, 405
 Justice, 268, 405

K

Kabir, 115, 116,
 Kaffirs, 178, 373
 Karma, vi, 363, 364
 Kismet, vi,

L

Landed Property—acquisition of by non-
 nationals under the Treaty with Britain,
 297
 Language Question, 156
 Beni Prasad, 158, 160
 Congress View, 157
 Hindu View, 157
 Mahasabha View, 157
 Muslim View, 157
 Muslim Grievances & Remedies, 161
 Pirpur Committee, 159
 Voluntary Agreement, 288
 Law—International, 272
 Law & Order, Maintenance of—A Voluntary
 Agreement, 293,

L

- Leaders, iii, iv
- League, All-India Muslim,
 - Broad Principles, 188
 - Charges against Congress Governments, 93
 - Committee of Action, 80a
 - Communal Settlement—Resolution of the Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference, 1938, 8
 - Constructive Programme, 12
 - Creed, 8, 11
 - Government Communique on the Letter Episode, 76
 - Jinnah invites Mahatma to write to him, 73
 - Jinnah on the Letter Episode, 77
 - Justifies its Stand-out, (Bombay Resolution, Aug. 1942), 54
 - Muslim Mind after the Cripps Break-down, 69
 - On Political Goal for India, 20
 - Pakistan Resolution, 1940, 199, 200
 - Position under the Indian Constitution Deadlock, according to Mr. Amery, 42
 - Rejection of the Cripps Proposals, 51
 - War Effort—Jinnah, 71
 - Warning to the British Government (Delhi Resolution of April, 1943) 73
- Legislatures—
 - Federal—Representation on, 277
 - Life of, 276
 - Provincial & States—Representation on, 301
- Little Moghuls, iv
- Lucifer's Choice, 242
- Lucknow Pact, 212, Appendix I

M

- Ma-Bap, 310, 311, 312
- Macdonald, Ramsay, 314, 319
- Madressahs, 169
- Mahasabha, All-India Hindu
 - A National Organisation, 376
 - Aims and Objects, 13
 - Amery must go, 80b
 - Attitude towards the Cow Question, 130
 - Charges against Muslim Governments, 96
 - Committee to investigate Hindu grievances against Muslim governments, 80b
 - Direct Action, 376
 - Future Constitution, Attitude towards, 14
 - Music before Mosques, 152
 - National Language & Script, 157
 - On Political Goal for India, 20
 - On the League's Delhi Resolution of April 1943, 76
 - Opposition to Pakistan, 225
 - Plan for Settlement, 56
 - Pliable Pawn, 376
 - Rejection of the Cripps Proposals, 48
 - Walked into the Parlour, 68, 376
- Mahatma Gandhi, 3
 - An Address to, 376
 - At the Bar of History, 406
 - On Hindustani Language, 158
 - On Riots, 101
 - What is a Gandhi! 391
- Mahatma Gandhi, 3 (Cont.)
 - What moral justification, 413
 - Withdraw & We shall Unite, 81
- Maimals, 104, 119
- Maintenance of Law and Order, See Law & Order
- Majlis-i-Ahrar,
 - Its Goal, 74
 - On Pakistan, 74, 211
- Majlis-Muslim, 78
 - Aims and Objects, 79
 - On Pakistan, 78, 79
 - Vis-a-vis the Muslim League, 78
- Majority Rule, Hindu, 90
- Makkah, 136, 144
- Maktabas, 169
- Malechchhas, 121, 178, 373
- Malik Barkat Ali,
 - " " " in 1931, 221
 - " " " in 1941, 217, 218
- Mandate to the First Federal House of Representatives, 296
- Man in the Street, i, 357, 372
- Masses, 3, 4, 309, 312
- Maxims, 268
- Méjèc, 380
- Middle Course, 268, 359
- Middle Path, 268, 359
- Military Assistance to United India under the Treaty with Britain, 260, 266, 297
- Military Careers, 394
- Minority-Great, 350
- Minority-Important, 350
- Minorities—Their position under the Plan of this Book, 353
- Minorities, Smaller-Conventions, 280
- Plebiscite, 281
- Renunciation, 265, 300
- Mirror, Before the, 371
- Mishkat, 136
- Moderation, 357, 361
- Modus Operandi, V.
- Mohmins-104, 119
 - All-India Momins Conference, April, 1943, 75
 - On Pakistan, 75
 - Vis-a-vis the All India Muslim League, 75
- Moore, Anacreon, 313
- Moplah Schools, Arabic Pandits, 166
- Conductors & Conductresses, 166
- Mosques, music before, 152
- Music before mosques, 152
 - Position in law, 153
 - Voluntary Agreement, 155, 287
- Muslimstans, 241
- Muslim Claim to be a Nation, 212, 356, 358
- Muslim claim to Territory, 212, 356
- Muslim Depressed Classes, 119, 356
- Muslim India, Dream of a—33
- Muslims, Indian and Western Democracy, 183
- Muslim League, All-India, See League
- Muslim National Home, 213
- Muslim National State, 213, 358
- Muslim Masses, 4
- Muslim Proletariat, 367
- Muslim Republics, Proposed New, 210, 21
- Muslim Society—

- Namaste, 164
- N**
- Nation at war with itself, 89
- Nation, Hindu Claim to be a, 376
- Nation, Muslim claim to be a, 212, 356, 358
- National Anthem, 170
- Solemn Affirmation, 173
- Voluntary Agreement, 291
- National Flag, 173
- Flag of Freedom, 175
- Muslim objection to Congress
- Tri-colour, 173
- March-Past in Chaman-i-Pakistan, 171
- Voluntary Agreement, 292
- National Home for the Muslims, 213
- National Minorities & International Guarantees—see Appendix V
- National State, Muslim, 213
- Nationalism, Bengalee, 195
- Nationalist Muslim Party, 1923, 221
- Negotiate, We shall not, 102
- Nemesis, 363, 364
- Non-Party Leaders' Conference—Accept
- Pakistan, 67
- O**
- Oracles—Old & New, 34
- Open Doors, 310, 311
- Opposed Economic Interests, 207
- Optionals, 305
- P**
- Pakistan—
- A Circle of Stagnation, 248
- A Possible Muslim Alternative, 91
- Attitude of the British Government, 243, 244
- Chaman-i-Pakistan, 174, 358
- Defined, 195
- Vis-a-vis Federation, 282
- PROS**
- Adopted by the Sind Legislative Assembly, 220
- Caliphate, 199
- Cultural Differences, 205
- Financially Sound, 267
- Hindus and Sikhs in, 216
- Independent Afghan States, 198
- Inspiration & Motivating Force, 218
- Linguistic Differences, 156, 206
- Muslim claim to be a Nation, 212
- Muslim claim to Territory, 212
- Muslim Countries in favour of Separation, 210
- Muslim & Non-Muslim Federation, 195
- National Home, 213
- National State, 213
- No basis for Hindu-Muslim Unity, 205
- Opposed Economic Interests, 207
- Resolution of League, Lahore, 1940, 199
- Resolution of League, Re-affirmed, 200
- Separation Idea regularly developed, 212
- Seven Schemes, 198
- Two Indias, 214
- Views for & and Against, 205
- CONS**
- Conception of Divided India not
- Islam's conception of India to be, 221
- Culture Argument and Safeguards, 226
- Likely Phases of Pakistan in Operation, 235

Pakistan— (Cont.)

- Mahomed Yusuf Sharerf, 232
- Matters for Muslims to consider, 235, 362
- Opposition from
- Arad (Independent) Muslim Conference, 277
- All-India Anglo-Indian & Domestic European Association, 274
- All-India Akali Conference, 223
- " " Depressed Classes Conference, 231
- " " Hindu Mahasabha, 225
- " " National League, 224
- Anti-Communal Conference, 233
- Khalsa National Party, 225
- Muslim Majlis, 231
- National Liberal Federation, 224
- South India Anti-Separation Conference, 231
- Political Unity of All-India, 220
- Its Limitations, 221
- Savarkar's Reaction to Sind Assembly Resolution on Pakistan, 237
- Separation and Safeguards will not go together, 235
- Sir Mirza Ismail, 234
- Sir S. Sultan Ahmad, 229
- Let there be Pakistan, 239
- Asses that went to government, 249
- Let us accept Pakistan—in Principle—
- Let us accept it here and now, 243
- Let us be just to each other, 244
- Lucifer's Choice, 242
- Strongest Gate, 241, 393
- The Principle, 243
- Panchayat System, 363
- Pandits, Arabic, 166
- Panipat, 366
- Partition, a Circle of Stagnation, 243, 248
- Patriots, 313, 372, 413
- Pawn against Pawn, 375
- Peace, Breaches of the, 294
- Peace Conference, 270
- Peace Delegation, India 271
- Peace Treaty, 270, 293
- Permanent Members, 273
- Permanent Minorities, 583
- Plain Word, VII
- Plan - Agreed, 258
- Plan of this Work, II
- Plebiscite, 281
- Plighted Faith, 384
- Plighted Word, 381
- Plutocracy, 345
- Political Consciousness—Development of—
- Among the masses and the Classes, 3
- Among the Muslim masses, 4
- Political Goal for India, See Goal,
- Political Interests—Conflict of, 87
- Political Nationalism, 4,
- Political Question, 181
- Political Relations of United India with Britain under the Treaty with Britain, 298
- Politicians, 389
- Portents, 78
- Poona Pact, 426
- Position Today, 42, 379

Powers & Functions, 281
 Powers-Residuary, 265, 281
 Prasthana, 163
 Prayashchitta, 368
 Preference, Tariff, 296
 Primary Members, 264
 Prime Ministers, 279
 Princes —
 Autocracy, 338, 345, 347
 Bapoo and his Children, 335, 338
 Basic Tests, 325
 Ameliorative Legislation, 326
 Anti-Corruption measures, 326
 Codification of Laws, 325
 Efficient and adequate police force, 325
 Planning, 326
 Privy Purse—Fixed, 326
 Properly manned Judiciary, 325
 British Government's Attitude re : Constitutional changes in States, 322
 Can the Princes fit into an Indian Federation?—Brailsford, 329
 Choice, the 337
 Congress Attitude Towards States, 37
 Declaration by the,—Accepting Principle of the Political Formula of THE INDIA CHARTER, 338
 Dominion Status, 38, 319, 320, 326
 Dual task, 339
 Duty—towards their Motherland, 339
 Duty—towards their Subjects, 339
 Federation—Accession, 264, 269
 Instrument of Accession, 276
 Federation and Paramountcy, 37
 Future Policy, 326
 Integrity of Units, 326
 Ordered Progress of the Country as a Self-governing autonomous Dominion, 326
 Unity of India 326
 Greatest Asset, 327
 India First—meaning of—to the, 325
 Ma-Bap Spirit, 337
 On Freedom, 326
 On the Eve of the Cripps Mission, 43
 Outlook, 327
 Pace of Administrative & Constitutional Reforms, 327
 Paramount Power, 322, 323, 324, 328, 331
 Paternalism, 337
 Pooling of Sovereignty by smaller States, 328
 Position under the Indian Constitutional Deadlock, according to Mr. Amery, 43
 Position vis-a-vis the Political Problem of India, The 'Princes' View-Point, 320, 337
 View-Point of States' Subjects, 320
 Brailsford on, 328, 329
 Princes' Part in United India, 336
 Princes' Sovereignty & Paramountcy—Reading, 330
 Promised Land, 339
 Reign of a Good Prince vs. Government of a Commonwealth, 317
 Responsible Govt., the Goal, 327, 333
 Survival, Conditions of, 328, 338
 Triple Obligations of—to the Crown, their States and to India 323

Princes— (Cont.)
 Under Federation
 Administration, 302
 Breakdown, 304
 Customs, Excise, etc., 303
 Electoral Colleges, 302
 Laws, 303
 Privy Purse, 303
 Press, 303
 Representative Institutions, 302
 Rights of Subjects, 303
 State-Groups & Sub-Groups, 302
 Taxation, 303
 Treaties with Paramount Power, 303
 Under the Political Formula of "THE INDIA CHARTER", 333
 It safeguards the interests of the Rulers, 333
 It advances the interests of the States Peoples, 334
 It safeguards the interests of the States vis-a-vis the other units of the Federation, 335
 It safeguards the interest of the States in relation to the Crown, 270, 335
 Views on the transfer of Power under Federation, 1935, 36
 Vis-a-vis Federation, 264, 270, 276, 302
 With Pakistan Functioning? 283, 332
 Princes' Subjects, 340
 Autocracy, 345, 347
 Barrier, 345, 346, 347, 348
 Deadlock, 345, 346, 347, 348
 Declaration by, 348
 Democracy—the Goal, 342
 Goal, 342, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349
 Golden Mean, 349
 Liliputian Eyes, 342
 Mantram, 342
 Middle Path, 346, 349
 Modern Democratic Theory, 342
 Political Guru—The Indian National Congress, 342, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349
 Under—Dog, 345, 346, 347
 Upper—Dog, 346
 Utopean Dream, 348
 Via Media, 346, 349
 Wagons hitched to Congress Star, 342, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349
 Principles, Fundamental—of a Constitution, 260, 262, 269
 Problem, Hindu-Muslim, 90
 Problem, of India, i, 310, 319, 372, 374
 Problem of Problems, 357, 374
 Processions, 294
 Proclamation, Queen Victoria's 1858, 16, 314
 Programme, v.
 Progress, Why no greater—Linlithgow, 257
 Promised Land, 412
 Punch, 272
 Punjab, Azad, 216

Q

Quadrupeds, 357
 Quinke—VIRI, 272
 Qur'an, The Holy, (Translation by Abdullah Yusuf Ali)
 Sura XXII, Verse, 28, H

- Qur'an, The Holy, (Translation by Abdullah Yusuf Ali) (Cont.)
 Sura XXII, Verse, 32, Hajj, 133
 " " " 33, " 133
 " " " 34, " 134
 " " " 35, " 134
 " " " 36, " 135
 " " " 37, " 135
 " XXXI, " 19, Luqman (The Wise), 95, 247
 " LI, " 6 Zariyat, 405

R

- Raiyats, 310
 Rama, 309
 Ramji-ki-Jai, 164
 Ramsay Macdonald, See Macdonald
 Ravana, 309
 Relations—External, 270
 Relations, Inter-Communal, 269
 Relations, with Britain, 265, 270, 282, 296
 Remember, 268
 Renunciation, Voluntary, of the Right of Vote, by the smaller Minorities, 265, 353
 Renunciation, Voluntary Declaration, 300, 354
 Representation on Federal Legislature, 277, 278
 „ on Provincial and States Legislatures 301
 „ on Services, 278, 301
 Republics, Proposed New, Muslim, 211
 Residuary Powers, 265, 281
 Responsibility—Collective, 281
 Revision of Constitution, 267, 281
 Revivalism, Responsible for Communal Diversities, 86, 382
 Rights, of a Community—the right of insurrection, 212
 Right to safeguards, 212
 „ of a Nation, the right of disruption, 213
 Right to demand separation, 213
 Rulers, to our British, 309

S

- Sabre—Rattling, 380
 Safeguards, 243
 Samples that Speak, 97
 Sancho Panza, 239, 244, 371
 Sangathan, the Hindu, 113
 Sarasvati, 163
 Sarkar, 310, 311
 Satyagraha, 310
 Savarkar, V. D., See under Mahasabha,
 At the Bar of History, 407
 Pliable Pawn, 376
 What is a Savarkar, 391
 What moral justification, 413
 Scheduled Castes—See Depressed Classes.
 Secession of Acceding Members, 282
 Seeing Eyes, 260
 Self-Determination, Our, 102
 Self-Expression, Our, 99
 Sentiment, 253, 314, 315
 Separate Communal Electorates, 300
 Separation, Separationists, 210, 212
 Separation—Tempo of— 248
 Shuddhi, 114
 Sikhs—

Conventions re: Legislation and on matters affecting the Sikhs, 281

Sikhs— (Cont.)

- On Pakistan—
 All-India Akali Conference, 225
 Khalsa National Party, 225
 Sardar Baldev Singh, 226
 Sir Jogendra Singh, 226
 Sir Sunder Singh, Majithia, 225
 Rejection of the Cripps Proposals, 50
 Silsila-i-Jamia-i-Vahdat Umam Islam, 211
 Similarities between Hindus and Muslims, 85
 Slaves and Sub-Slaves, 104
 Slaves of Slaves, 363
 Social Codes, Hinduism and Islam are, 88
 Social Intercourse, 175
 Assurances, 179
 Kaffirs, 178
 Malechchhas, 121, 178
 Muslim Mind, an analysis, 177
 Social Systems, Divergence of, 87
 Soliloquy, 371
 Sovereign State, 272
 Speakers, 279
 Stagnation, Circle of, 248
 Stalemate, 311, 412
 Stans, 241
 States, see Princes.
 State, the Federal, See Federation,
 Students and Politics, 390, 393
 Sudras, 372
 Summing-up, 397
 Suppressed Classes—See Depressed Classes,
 Swords will be unsheathed, 103

T

- Tangle, 401
 Temperament, Indian, 86
 Text-books, 170
 Tide, The-turns, 54
 TODAY, 23
 Tolerance, 268
 Trade and Empire, 315
 Traditions, 136
 Treaties, of States with Paramount Power—
 Suspension of—under Federation, 303
 Lapse of—under Federation, 303
 Treaty, Inter-communal, 258, 286
 Treaty between Free India and Britain, 270, 296
 Treaty—what Free India would expect of Britain, 259
 Trust, 268, 371
 Trustees, 309, 312, 313, 315
 Twice-Born, 372, 388
 Two Indias, 214

U

- Under-Dog, 345, 346, 347, 367
 Union, See Federation
 United India, 269, 272, 273, 284, 313, 319, 335
 See also Federation
 United India and Britain, 270
 United India and External Relations, 270
 Unity, 258, 261, 315
 Unity, Lack of, 313, 314
 Untouchables, Our, 104, 105
 Untouchables, New Religion for, 114, 118
 Untouchability—Removal of
 The All-India Hindu League, 111
 The All-India Hindu Mahasabha, 111

Untouchability—Removal of (Cont.)

- The All-India Hindu Youth Conference, 112
- Dharma Sabhas—Public Temples, 118, 122
- Kabir on—115
- The Lord Shri Krishna to Arjuna, 110
- The Lord Shri Krishna to Narada, 117
- The Problem, 121
 - Economic Disabilities, 123
 - Religious Disabilities, 122
 - Social Disabilities, 122
- Upper-Dog, 346
- Urdu-Hindi Controversy, see under "Language Question,"
- Urdu Language,
 - Its Origin, 156
 - Urdu Schools, 161, 162
- Utopean Dream, 348

V

- Verdict of History, 83, 408
- Via Media, v, 346, 349, 366
- Vicious Circles, 400, 404, 412
- Viddia Mandir Scheme, 168, 169
- Village System, Indian, 309
- Vision of Youth, 391
- Vista, 391
- Vivisection, 361, 367, 368
- Voluntary Renunciation, see Renunciation.

W

- Wagons hitched to the Congress Star, 342, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349

War—

- An alternative arrangement, 270-71
- Indian Peace Delegation—
 - Composition 271
 - Constitution, 271
- India's place in—British Government in relation to, 35
 - How a Turkish Journalist looks at it, 35
- Principles—Vis-a-vis United India, 298-99
- Sine-qua-non—Do. 270
- Wavell, Viscount, on the Indian Political Problem, 80a
- Warned, We have been 248
- Will-O'-the-Wisp, 401
- Wisdom speaks, 381
- With, Without, In spite, 102
- Wooing of Youth, 390
 - And the Response! 390

Y

- Yesterday, 1
- Young India, iv, 312, 313, 414, 415
- Youth, 386, 389, 414

Z

- Zarathushtra to Anura Mazda, 411, 415
- Zu-'l-Hijjah, 133, 136, 144